

CAFF Management Meeting 13-15 December, 1999-12-11

Summary Report

Introduction

The CAFF National Representatives and Permanent Participants met in Trondheim, Norway, December 13-15 to discuss program work. Participant list is provided in Appendix I.

Agenda Item 1: Welcome

Berit Lein, CAFF Chair, welcomed participants to Norway and the meeting.

Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

The Agenda was adopted with the following changes:

- Agenda item no. 6 will be discussed Wednesday morning.
- Item 5 will be discussed before item 4.
- Discussion on Species of Common Conservation Concern and status of the *ad hoc* Flora Group will be added as Agenda Item 14.

Agenda Item 3: Review of CAFF VII

The Executive Secretary briefly reviewed decisions from CAFF VII and their status.

Agenda Item 4: Arctic Council Working Group (AC WG) Chairs' meeting and SAO Meeting

The Chair spoke to a brief report from the AC WG Chairs' meeting in Washington, September 17, 1999. She highlighted the following:

- The AC WG's have agreed to rotate the responsibilities for preparing agenda for these meetings. The CAFF Secretariat will be responsible for preparing the next agenda and preparing a matrix of AC WG activities to better focus discussion on areas of mutual interest.
- At least three AC WGs are now directly or indirectly involved in preparing project proposals to the Global Environment Facility (GEF). There is a need to harmonise and co-ordinate these activities both for GEF's benefit and because of the added value of collaboration.
- With respect to the last point of the WG Chairs' report, which notes that "WGs shall not engage in Memorandum of Understanding or Contracts with other bodies, unless so guided by the SAOs", it was clarified that this does not apply to contracts that countries have made with the CAFF Secretariat or contracts that the Secretariat makes with consultants in order to deliver Work Plan items.

Agenda Item 4: GEF Project

The Chair introduced this item. She regretted lack of involvement of other countries in the process so far. A gap in the GEF portfolio in the Russian Arctic, identified by UNEP, had presented a “window of opportunity” which she decided to act on with only a month to respond. The first planning meeting, involving RF State Committee of Environmental Protection, GRID-Arendal, the CAFF Chair and Secretariat was held in Trondheim the first week of August, with follow-up meetings in Moscow. As a result of this planning work, UNEP has now agreed to fund a PDF-A project phase (\$ 25 000 US) with the Norwegian Foreign Ministry providing \$45 000 in co-financing.

Lars Kullerud, GRID-Arendal, gave a thorough presentation of the project’s preparation phases (PDF-A and PDF-B) and their management structure. It is proposed that GRID-Arendal serves as the overall administrator of the project and that the CAFF Secretariat provides secretariat functions to the Steering Committee and the Expert Task Team.

The Chair invited other countries to participate in the PDF phases and the full project, through bilateral activities, expert institutional input, cash contributions, or other appropriate means.

Russia stressed the importance of the GEF project and informed that they have hired a national co-ordinator for the project, Evgeny Kuznetsov. Finland expressed a general interest in following the project development and to participate in the Moscow workshop (early February), with the intent to consider deeper commitment. Sweden has development funds for Eastern Europe/Russia, which might be applied towards this project. WWF-Arctic expressed interest in participating and mentioned several relevant WWF projects, e.g. the map of Twenty-five Largest Undisturbed Arctic Areas, a WWF workshop in Lena-Thordelskjold Station in the summer of 2000, EXPO 2000, as well as links developed with Russian regional authorities. The US asked project proponents to consider also the Russian Far-east, since most of US-Russian bilateral activities are focused there.

The meeting discussed CAFF’s sustained involvement in the project and the role of the CAFF Secretariat. Participants agreed that it would be necessary to somehow secure continuity and “long-term memory” for the project.

The meeting mandated the CAFF Secretariat to participate as proposed (in the PDF-A request) until the end of the PDF phases in 2001, given that resources will be allocated from the project to fulfil this role.

The meeting discussed pros and cons of having one lead – country, versus rotating lead with the CAFF chairmanship. It was noted that the leadership would carry a considerable responsibility, i.e. through participation in the Steering Committee, but would not necessarily be intensive labour. No consensus was reached on this issue.

The CAFF Chair will lead the project up to the Ministerial meeting in fall 2000. The leadership issue will be revisited at CAFF VIII.

The meeting encouraged Norway to seriously consider taking on the lead for the GEF project.

Countries will go back and consider how and if to participate in the GEF project and indicate their interests through correspondence with the Chair as soon as possible, and preferably before the workshop in Moscow [February 1-3(4), 2000]

Agenda Item 5: CAFF Overview Report

The Overview Editorial Team (ET) met in Helsinki on December 9-11 and provided a report to the CAFF Management meeting.

The ET still believes that it is possible to deliver an almost final draft to the Ministers in October 2000. This, however, will demand a solid input by countries and compliance to the ET timeline presented.

The meeting adopted the timeline and To-do list as presented by the ET.

The ET meeting in Helsinki prepared a draft list of boxes and identified potential authors. The authors will be contacted during the next couple of weeks. The list will be circulated to NRs for information before Christmas.

According to information from the publishing company, Edita, printing the whole report simultaneously in five languages¹ will approximately double the print cost, i.e. from \$75 000 US to approximately \$150 000 US.

The meeting decided, as a first step, to print an English version with Executive Summaries in main Arctic languages.

The cash budget provided by the ET, \$130 000 US, has been based on a proposal set forth at CAFF VII. Prior to the meeting \$102 500 had been secured.

Norway has decided [17.12.99] to provide \$15 000 cash to the Overview project. Sweden indicated that they would not be able to contribute in year 2000, leaving a \$12 500 US gap to be filled.

GRID-Arendal offered to investigate if UNEP would be willing to sell the report through their web-shop and thus generate some revenue.

Input from the Circumpolar Seabird Working Group (CSWG) was discussed.

The ET will contact the CSWG, or a CSWG member, to contribute information on seabirds. Canada/CSWG will provide the murre poster and circumpolar map of murre colonies to the ET by April 2000.

The ET will provide draft of all Chapters 1-10 to countries by February 5, 2000. The review process is two-fold: a "political" review of recommendations and all chapters

¹ Note: Small number of copies in most languages.

(to identify gaps and/or major concerns) in time for the SAO meeting (deadline March 15); and a more detailed expert review (deadline May 1).

Finland agreed to number all paragraphs in the draft report to facilitate the review.

Recommendations of the Overview Report were discussed. The ET emphasised that the Conclusion's and Recommendation's Chapter (Chapter 10) would be the most politically sensitive part of the report and that it would be essential to screen this chapter through the SAO process at their next meeting in last week of April. Thus the deadline for input by countries was set at January 10, 2000.

The meeting agreed that the Overview should have only relatively few (5-8), practical recommendations that would motivate real actions by the Ministers. Countries agreed to provide ideas/suggestions for recommendations by January 10, 2000.

After some discussion on general criteria for the recommendations, Paula Kankaanpää and Snorri Baldursson were charged with developing guidelines for countries to consider with respect to developing these recommendations (see Appendix II).

Agenda Item 6: Circumpolar Protected Areas Network (CPAN)

CPAN Discussion Paper

The US introduced the CPAN discussion paper and noted that since other countries, except Canada, had not yet identified participants on the CPAN Standing Committee, the paper might reflect N-American views.

The US called for immediate nominations from countries on the CPAN Standing Committee and offered to host a CPAN workshop in Alaska in late April, 2000, to address outstanding CPAN issues.

Participants noted that the paper did not discuss the status or future of the CPAN Strategy and Action Plan. A question was raised if the mandate for the CPAN Standing Committee was clear. Participants emphasised the need to update information on Arctic PA's and that this could be done in relation to the planned Pan-Arctic Protected Areas Registry. Iceland emphasised the need to link CPAN to other PA networks, such as the Emerald Network of the Bern Convention.

Countries committed to nominate representatives to the CPAN Standing Committee. The current mandate of the CPAN Standing Committee is to provide CAFF VII with an analysis of current status of CPAN and suggestions for the way ahead.

The CPAN Standing Committee will initially work through Email correspondence. The Committee will decide if a CPAN workshop in April, as offered by the US, has any added value at this stage.

The meeting accepted Norway's offer to update the current data on CPAN (i.e. to provide an updated list of Arctic PAs: number, size and location), with input

from all countries, and to complete this list by end of April, 2000, for submission to CAFF Editorial Team.

Gap Analysis

The gap analysis project is close to completion, with advanced drafts of text and maps prepared. Final draft is expected in late January, 2000.

The CAFF Secretariat will aim to have the report printed in February/March. Due to expenses involved in printing 19-20 colour maps, the Secretariat will initially print a minimum number (50-70) of copies as the budget allows.

Marine Paper

Canada asked for advice on how to proceed with the draft report "Summary of Legal Mechanisms for Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment".

The meeting decided to print the report as CAFF Habitat Conservation Report No 8. Final comments from countries are due by February 10, 2000.

Sacred Sites

The CAFF Executive Secretary informed the meeting that the Danish Environmental Protection Agency, DEPA, is willing to fund the RAIPON/CAFF project on Sacred Sites and Sanctuaries of indigenous people of Arctic Russia. The project proposal is now under final review and revision.

Agenda Item 7: Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA)

The Executive Secretary briefed the meeting on progress and status of this initiative and emphasised the need for countries to consider how CAFF could contribute to specific Impact Topics relevant to the CAFF mandate, such as on Reindeer/Caribou, Coastal Fisheries, Marine Mammals, Forests and Forestry, Conservation/wildlife management. CAFF should also initiate a process to identify relevant experts and potential Lead-authors, who could participate in the first ACIA Implementation workshop planned for in early 2000 [this workshop will be held in Washington DC, February 29 to March 2, 2000].

Sweden noted that they would not be able to lead the ACIA on behalf of CAFF as Lars-Erik Liljelund has taken on other commitments. Norway volunteered to take over the Lead for ACIA and suggested Pål Prestrud, Director of Research, Norwegian Polar Institute, as a lead person for CAFF.

It was noted that CAFF could contribute also to the general overview section of the scientific document (Volume II) and that CAFF, in addition to providing information, could ask the Assessment Steering Committee to make sure that CAFF's interests were included in the assessment. It was further noted that climate change impacts on wetlands, estuaries and coastal fringes could have grave consequences relevant to the CAFF mandate and that the ACIA should not forget Arctic vegetation.

Several participants were concerned that the ACIA Implementation Plan did not really specify what was expected in terms of input and that they would prefer to wait until

the project was scoped in more detail. A development of an outline or draft Table of Contents from a CAFF perspective would greatly facilitate CAFF review of the project and the identification of tentative Lead-authors.

The meeting accepted Norway's offer to lead the ACIA, on behalf of CAFF, and Paul Presterud as the Lead person.

Norway (Paul Presterud) agreed to send out a letter as soon as possible, including a "think-piece" or draft ACIA Table of Contents from a CAFF perspective. The letter should also include a request to countries to identify tentative Lead-authors who could participate in the ACIA Implementation workshop.

Participants emphasised the relatedness of the ACIA and the Biodiversity Monitoring initiatives and suggested close collaboration.

The meeting decided to propose to the Assessment Steering Committee that the two planned workshops were held back-to-back, starting with the biodiversity workshop. Iceland offered to host both workshops in Reykjavik.

Agenda Item 8. Circumpolar Seabird Working Group (CSWG)

The US spoke to a tabled summary report from the recent CSWG meeting in Ottawa (December 3-5, 1999). In general the work of the CSWG is going well. The following points were highlighted:

Implementation of both Murre and Eider strategies is progressing well with no need for action by National Representatives at this stage.

Preparations for the Seabird Bycatch Workshop, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, April 25-28, 2000, are proceeding. It will focus on: (1) bycatch in long-line fisheries and how to support work under FAO and (2) bycatch in gillnet fisheries, which as yet is not formally dealt with by global initiatives. The workshop will seek participation from seabird experts and fisheries people. Currently there is a N-American bias in terms of potential participants. The CSWG asks countries to notify FAO representatives, relevant fisheries persons and other representatives for the workshop. All should be aware that the workshop will generate recommendations.

Countries will identify FAO contacts and tentative workshop participants and provide this information to the workshop planners (John Chardine).

The CSWG was unclear as to who is leading the proposed Arctic Migratory Bird Workshop in Wageningen, May 2000, and suggested closer contacts with the workshop planner (Wetlands International) so that CAFF concerns could be properly addressed. It was clarified that Russia is leading this item in collaboration with The Netherlands (Ministry for Agriculture, Fisheries and Nature Conservation). Wetlands International have been contracted to prepare and conduct the workshop.

The CAFF Secretariat will contact The Netherlands (Gerard Boere) and Wetlands International and request that they consult with CSWG when preparing the agenda for the workshop.

The US distributed a CAFF outreach brochure on proper conduct of tourists at Arctic seabird colonies. *Countries will provide CSWG with contacts working on seabird outreach material.*

The report on Harvest of Seabirds in Arctic Countries is almost completed. CSWG asks for guidance on printing. *The CAFF Secretariat will print the report as soon as it receives the final text from the US.*

Canada has prepared a draft murre poster with a map of all Arctic murre colonies. The plan is to finalise this before the SAO meeting. *Canada will provide the CAFF Overview ET with this material by April, 2000.*

The Circumpolar Murre Monitoring Plan is in its final stages and *the US will print it in time for the Biodiversity Workshop in Iceland (February 7-9, 2000).*

The CSWG is interested in developing an Oil Vulnerability Index for seabirds in the Arctic. Participants noted that EPPR, through the Norwegian Consultant Agency, Aqua Niva, is working on a similar concept or a map of Arctic sites at risk from oil pollution. *Norway will approach Aqua Niva and suggest a formal link to CAFF's seabird group and the Overview Project.*

The next CSWG meeting will be held in Finland in the fall of year 2000. The US will continue to lead CSWG.

Agenda Item 9. Circumpolar Marine Workshop

Kevin McCormick briefed the meeting on the Circumpolar Marine Workshop in Montreal, November 28 to December 2, and introduced a draft report from the workshop on Themes, Main Issues and Recommendations, submitted by Jeanne Pagnan, on behalf of the CMW Planning Team. His view was that the workshop had been a good one and generated useful discussions and recommendations that needed further consolidation. Once this has been done, CAFF will need to address the recommendations.

The meeting discussed the draft report and provided the Planning Team with guidance on how to prepare the next draft of the CMW recommendations. Participants were of the opinion that the proper channel for recommendations related to the marine environment would be through the CAFF Overview Report.

The meeting charged Kevin McCormick and Aevan Petersen with drafting a letter to Jeanne Pagnan/the Planning Team with general comments on the draft report and guidance for its future development (attached as Appendix III).

CAFF will discuss the final CMW report and recommendations at the next CAFF meeting.

Eventual CAFF recommendations to Ministers, arising from the CMW, will be built into the CAFF Overview Report.

Agenda Item 10. Biodiversity Monitoring

Iceland introduced this topic and briefed on progress since CAFF VII in Yellowknife. Workshop dates have been set at February 7-9, 2000, with Reykjavik as a venue. An invitation and a draft agenda was circulated to countries in October.

The meeting noted that the Biodiversity Workshop and the planned ACIA Implementation workshop were related and suggested they were held back to back (see pt 7). However, it would be important to have the Biodiversity Workshop first in order to provide consolidated input to ACIA.

The Executive Secretary briefed the meeting on a proposed WCMC/RAIPON project on Traditional Ecological Knowledge of Russian indigenous people and its use in biodiversity and climate change monitoring work.

Bill Heal briefed the meeting on a European Union initiative aiming at networking European monitoring field sites and asked for a support letter from CAFF.

See Agenda pt 7

Agenda Item 11: CAFF Workshops in spring of 2000.

Refer to Agenda Item 7 for discussions on the two CAFF workshops in spring of 2000: the Bycatch Workshop and the Arctic Migratory Bird Workshop.

Agenda Item 12: Reporting Format

The Executive Secretary introduced this item and noted that there was a standing request from Ministers to report on the various CAFF strategies. However, there is no agreement on the reporting procedure. Thus he proposed to develop a simple questionnaire for circulation to countries well in advance of the Ministerial Meeting. The meeting agreed on this approach to reporting

The Secretariat will develop a simple questionnaire/reporting format for each CAFF strategy and circulate to countries well in advance of the next Ministerial Meeting.

Agenda Item 13: Administration

Next CAFF WG and Management Meetings

The Chair proposed a CAFF Head's of Delegation's Meeting in Copenhagen in the first week of May, 2000, to prepare deliverables for the Ministerial Meeting. She further suggested to host CAFF VIII before, instead of after, the Ministerial for several logistic and practical reasons.

The meeting agreed on Copenhagen in the second week of May 2000, as tentative venue and dates for CAFF's Heads of Delegation meeting [dates

have been set at May 8-10], and September 7-10, 2000, Tromsø, as tentative dates and venue for CAFF VIII [dates have been set at September 9-11, 2000].

Operating Guidelines.

The US circulated a new draft of the CAFF Operating Guidelines (OGs) and suggested final comments. The US has consulted with their SAO and made sure that the OGs are consistent with the AC Rules of Procedures.

The meeting discussed what if any external (non-CAFF countries) participants should sit on CAFF *ad hoc* groups and *suggested that external involvement would be especially beneficial in review processes.*

The Secretariat will review the draft Operating Guidelines for consistency with current CAFF policies and mandate and send them out to countries for final review by January 10, 2000. Countries will provide comments to the US by February 10, 2000.

CAFF Communications Strategy

Iceland introduced a new draft of the CAFF Communications Strategy and suggested one final round of comments with deadline February 10. GRID-Arendal suggested that CAFF prepared a one-page, non-technical brief for the Arctic Parliamentarians' meeting in August 2000.

The Secretariat will review the Communications Strategy together with the OPs and send them out to countries for final review by January 10, 2000. Countries will provide final comments by February 10, 2000.

CAFF Secretariat Report

The Executive Secretary spoke briefly to a written report, highlighting Secretariat activities since CAFF VII in Yellowknife. He notified the meeting of progress on a totally renovated CAFF website (<http://www.grida.no/caff>), which is now close to completion.

The Executive Secretary provided the meeting with budget statements for 1998 and half of 1999. Participants noted that an overview of revenue and a balance statement was lacking and requested the Secretariat to provide this in writing to the National Representatives.

The Secretariat will provide, in writing, a more detailed Budget Statement to the National Representatives.

Agenda Item 14: Flora Group and Species of Common Conservation Concern

The US briefed the meeting on status of the *ad hoc* Flora Group. Finland, Canada and Norway have already nominated participants and other countries, Iceland, Greenland, are considering this.

Rare Species and Species of Common Conservation Concern

The US introduced this topic and noted several problems with providing a list of species according to the format provided by the Secretariat. These problems relate e.g. to different definitions of “rare“, “common conservation concern”, lack of information, lack of consensus, reluctance by scientists, etc.

Participants discussed this problem and noted that it might be of more interest for the Overview Report to highlight **why** it is difficult to create such lists (i.e. lack of knowledge) and to look at trends in number of species being listed in the Arctic.

Countries agreed to provide the Secretariat/Overview ET information on officially listed vertebrate and vascular plant species in their respective Arctic ranges with dates when listed. [Countries should also provide information on species that have been recently taken off red lists.]

The Overview ET will present this information in a country by country or other appropriate fashion.

Agenda Item 14: Any Other Business

Saami Fisheries Project

Niels Ole Gaup briefed on the status of the Saami AC Sustainable Development Program's (SDP) Freshwater and Coastal Fishing Projects. A workshop was held in Alta, Norway, in June and a report issued in Norwegian. The meeting discussed CAFF involvement in other AC projects.

The meeting agreed that it is important that CAFF provides technical assistance and review functions for various AC related projects, if relevant for the CAFF mandate. A more formal involvement will require discussion among CAFF representatives.

Living Global Environment Outlook

GRID-Arendal briefed the meeting on an Internet version of UNEP's Global Environment Outlook report, which is intended to be a living document. GRID-Arendal will come back to countries in the year 2000 with information request.

15. Update of CAFF Work Plan

The CAFF Work Plan 1999-2000 was updated as follows:

- 1.1. Biodiversity Monitoring Workshop dates, February 7-9, 2000. Venue Reykjavik, Iceland
- 2.1. No change
- 2.2. No change
- 2.3. No Change
- 2.4. No change
- 2.5. No change
- 2.6. Final version of the “CAFF Technical Report No. 5: Harvest of Seabirds in the Circumpolar Region” has been prepared. The report will be published in January/February 2000.

- 2.7. The Workshop of Bycatch of Seabirds in Commercial Fisheries will be held in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, April 26-28, 2000.
- 2.8. No change.
- 3.1 The report “Summary of Legal Mechanisms for Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment” will be printed as CAFF Habitat Conservation Report No. 8, in early 2000, after final country comments by February 10, 2000.
- 3.2 Completed.
- 3.3 No change.
- 3.4 Completed
- 3.5 No change.
- 3.6 *New item on “Sacred Sites and Sanctuaries of Indigenous People in relation to CPAN” (Russia/RAIPON)*
- 4.1 The lead for this item has moved to Norway
- 4.2 *New item on “GEF Project: Integrated Ecosystem Approach to Conserve Biodiversity and Minimise Habitat Fragmentation in Arctic Russia” (Norway)*
- 5.2. Deadline has changed to early 2000.

ADMINISTRATION

- No change

APPENDIX I

Participants list:

Berit Lein, Norway
Jan Petter Hubert-Hansen, Norway
Finn Kateraas, Norway
Gunnbjörg Naavik, Norway
Kevin McCormick, Canada
Paula Kankaanpaa, Finland
Peter Nielsen, Greenland
Aevar Petersen, Iceland
Jon Gunnar Ottósson, Iceland
Vladimir Pisheliev, Russia
Sune Sohlberg, Sweden
Janet Hohn, USA
Rodion Suliandziga, RAIPON
Galina Volkova, RAIPON
Niels Ole Gaup, Saami Council
Bill Heal, UK
Lars Kullerud, UNEP GRID-Arendal
Peter Prokosch, WWF-Arctic
Tove Sövndahl Petersen, IPS
Alona Yefimenko, IPS
Snorri Baldursson, CAFF Secretariat

APPENDIX II

CAFF Overview ET
PK/SB 14.12.99

DRAFT GUIDELINES TO NRs FOR DEVELOPING RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations

- Each country should be free to come up with several recommendations.
- The Arctic Ministers are the recipients. Hence it is important that the recommendations are understandable, practical and motivating for action.
- Recommendations should be consistent with the mandate and objectives of CAFF in terms of Arctic biodiversity conservation and management, but may also be relevant for a broader audience.
- Country specific recommendations should be avoided.
- Countries should not only consider recommendations relevant for species and habitat conservation, but also functional systems.
- Recommendations on pollution prevention, emergency response etc. should be avoided.
- In the end the recommendations should reflect issues addressed in the report (Chapters 1-9). However, as the text only exists in a draft form, it can also be amended to underpin specific recommendations.
- There are several ways of conceptually organise the thinking on the recommendations, e.g. **policy/management, information sharing, research,** and/or in terms of major threats such as **fragmentation, overexploitation, ecosystem approach,** etc.

Summary To Do list for NRs till spring 2000 (Note: a more detailed timeline will be submitted by the ET).

Activity	Responsibility		Deadline
	ET	NRs	
Recommendations		Provide ET with ideas for recommendations	January 10
	Draft #2 – all chapters including Ch 10		February 5
		Detailed country review of recommendations	March 15
Book Review		General review (major concerns) of Draft #2	March 15
		Detailed scientific review of #2	May 1

To: Planning Committee
Circumpolar Marine Workshop

From: Chair, Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna

Date:

Re: Draft Themes, Main Issues and Recommendations

Thank you for the timely completion of the initial draft of the themes, issues and recommendations from the Circumpolar Marine Workshop. The CAFF National Representative reviewed the draft summary and offer the following comments to guide the development of the next draft.

- 1) As the final summary and recommendations could be circulated to persons who did not attend the workshop, it would be helpful to provide an Introduction, which summarizes the rationale, sponsoring agencies and goal for the workshop.
- 2) It is suggested that the “existing team of specialist should remain in place...to track progress on the Workshop Report and recommendations, prepare a progress report for the co-sponsors and recommend further steps.” In our opinion, this statement does not reflect the decision reached at the workshop. It is our view that the Planning Committee would remain in place only until the final workshop report and recommendations have been transmitted to the co-sponsoring agencies. Further action with respect to the recommendations will be the responsibility of the sponsoring agencies.
- 3) The ten themes could be further consolidated - particularly those relating to marine management tools, integrated marine management, marine protection and marine resource management.
- 4) The current extensive list recommendations could be further consolidated. While it is difficult to prescribe an appropriate number of recommendations, there was a general view at the workshop that 10-15 recommendations would be adequate. The recommendations should focus on tangible issues that could be addressed or be relevant at the circumpolar level.
- 5) We note that the section relating to a “Circumpolar Marine Strategy” goes beyond the discussions in the plenary and proposes a number of specific steps. It would be more appropriate to address this issue through a recommendation (under one of the consolidated themes referenced in item 3) for consideration by the sponsoring agencies.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to review the initial draft. I look forward to the next draft of the workshop report.

Berit Lein, Chair

cc. John Karau, Chair PAME
Nancy Foster, IUCN