

## Draft Minutes

# CAFF Heads of Delegation Meeting, Copenhagen, May 8-10, 2000

## Draft Report

### 1. Welcome.

Berit Lein, CAFF Chairman, welcomed participants and introduced a revised draft agenda (Appendix I), which was accepted.

### 2. Highlights from the SAO Meeting in Fairbanks

The Executive Secretary introduced a written CAFF Highlights' Report from the SAO Meeting. He noted that CAFF's report had received good and encouraging comments. The CAFF/UNEP/GEF PDF-B Project was positively commented and supported in principle by all countries except the US, which did not mention it. The US emphasised that this did not mean that the US is against the project.

Iceland asked about support received from countries for the GEF PDF-B phase. The Executive Secretary informed that Norway, Finland and the Netherlands, have already provided cash support and that Canada has been approached with such a request. Canada reported from a recent meeting between GRID-Arendal and CIDA (Canadian International Development Agency) in Ottawa, which had been positive but non-conclusive in terms of direct cash support.

The Chair introduced written minutes from the Working Group (WG) Chairs' meeting in Fairbanks. Issues discussed at that meeting were *inter alia*: coordination of WG activities; potential overlap with new Arctic Council activities; types of issues to be dealt with by the WG Chairs; and WG reporting to Ministers. The Chair noted that cooperation among the Arctic Council WGs is good, although there is always room for improvement. There is clearly some overlap of mandates among the WGs but currently no evidence of duplication.

Participants discussed the Press Release from the SAO meeting, which was not considered balanced in terms of reflecting environmental versus sustainable development work of the Council. One way to improve the situation would be to have the WG Chairs' discuss and approve the Press Release.

*Participants agreed that CAFF and the other WGs needed to be more proactive during the preparation of Arctic Council press releases. The Chair agreed to raise this issue with the Arctic Council Chair and to propose this as an agenda items at the next WG Chairs' meeting.*

Items related to SDP and ACAP were deferred to Agenda Item 6.

### 3 CAFF Chairmanship.

The Chair informed the meeting that the CAFF Chair, after Norway's turn is still vacant. However there are two offers for CAFF Vice-chair (i.e. incoming Chair in 2002), Sweden and USA.

*No country volunteered to take on the role of CAFF Chair in the fall of 2000, but countries will consider.*

#### 4. Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA)

The Chair informed that there is a vacant second seat for CAFF on the ACIA Assessment Steering Committee (ASC) and asked for volunteers. She informed that Pål Prestrud, the ASC Vice-chair, had suggested a climate change expert from CAFF for this role. She further noted that it would be beneficial for continuation and regular reporting to the CAFF Management Board to have the Secretariat as observer at ASC meetings.

Participants discussed whether the second ASC seat should be filled by a CAFF scientist or a person representing the CAFF Management Board. It was noted that lead-authors will be represented on the ASC to ensure scientific integrity of the process and hence it might be secure management input from CAFF.

*It was agreed to wait with decision on a second ASC CAFF representative until CAFF VIII. Pending decision, the US volunteered to attend the next meeting of the ASC in Copenhagen, June 15-16, 2000.*

Iceland questioned if lead-authors should have a seat on the ASC. The Chair suggested that Iceland raised this issue through the SAO process.

The Secretariat informed on the process of identifying lead-authors for ACIA. A letter will be sent out shortly from the ASC Chair, asking for nominations. The deadline for nominations will be June 1, 2000. Participants agreed on the importance to respond to this request and have a solid biological input to the ACIA. Some cautioned against too much climate modelling focus.

ICC informed about a tremendous amount of data on hunting management and land-use changes in Canada and noted that it was important to use this data in the ACIA process. It was suggested that ICC raise this issue with the ASC and propose a lead/contributing author.

The Terms of Reference for the ASC were discussed.

*The meeting accepted the Terms of Reference with the qualification that it should be made very clear that ALL Arctic countries have access to the ASC, through lead-authors or by other means.*

The issue of financing the ACIA process was discussed. Norway informed that the issue of funding the ACIA process had already be raised in budget negotiations in Norway. Other countries were encouraged to do the same.

Participants discussed reporting of ACIA progress to the Arctic Council.

*The meeting agreed that CAFF/AMAP should maintain their role in reporting to the Arctic Council, although this role could be partly delegated to the ASC Chair.*

The Chair informed about informal discussions among CAFF and AMAP to have a joint meeting focusing on projects of joint interest such as ACIA and monitoring work.

*Participants agreed that such a meeting would be beneficial and suggested venue back to back with CAFF VIII. The Chair agreed to follow up with AMAP [Note: these consultations have already been held. AMAP is considering a proposal to have this joint meeting in Trondheim, Monday, September 4 – see Appendix II].*

#### 5. GEF Project.

The Executive Secretary briefed about developments after the PDF-B application was submitted to the GEF Secretariat in the first week of March. In the third week of March, the GEF Secretariat responded with a requests for clarifications regarding, especially

## Draft Minutes

commitment by regional authorities, the proposed implementation mechanisms and the capacity of CAFF and UNEP GRID-Arendal to execute the project. Some of these requests were really outdated, since CAFF had already clarified them during the preparation of the PDF-B. CAFF submitted clarifications again in the fourth week of March and the GEF Secretariat requested time until May 12 to respond.

The Chair noted that she had hoped for a positive decision by the GEF Secretariat by the time of the Heads of Delegation Meeting in order to initiate a constructive dialogue on participation among the countries. Unfortunately, this had not happened and current prospects for a positive answer from GEF were not very encouraging.

*[Note: the GEF Secretariat responded on May 12 that they will need still more time, or until June, to make a final decision. The GEF Secretariat further noted in their response that the project is fundable, in principle, but that there still are some concerns about its size and implementation arrangements].*

The Chair informed that since the beginning of the project she had received several advices on how to approach and work with the GEF Secretariat. However, the project team had chosen to rely on advice from UNEP Nairobi. She informed that the development of the project had taken much more time and energy than she had anticipated last fall when this “window of opportunity” was identified. The Executive Secretary noted that a significant part of the Secretariat’s collective energy had also been devoted to this project.

Participants agreed that the project was important and could be considered a “deliverable”, whether it succeeded or not. If it succeeds it will obviously be a major task for CAFF, if not, CAFF could deliver the PDF-A Report as well as a case study (letter) on the application process and working with the GEF Secretariat.

The issue of co-funding was discussed briefly. ICC suggested to engage the Secretariat of the Convention of Biological Diversity, once and if the PDF-B was accepted, to tap into the massive co-funds needed for the main project.

*It was decided to wait with serious discussion on the PDF-B budget and co-funding until final answer from the GEF Secretariat has been received. In case of a positive answer, the Chair will arrange a teleconference among the CAFF National Representatives to discuss funding issues and next steps.*

## 6. ACAP, SDP and CAFF.

The Chair and Executive Secretary introduced. The current draft of the SDP (Arctic Council Sustainable Development Program) covers sustainable use of living resources, which also is within the mandate of CAFF. The ACAP (Arctic Council Action Plan to Eliminate Pollution of the Arctic) strategic part and action plan focuses currently only on pollution prevention. ACAP’s implementation is still being discussed, with two models debated: (1) implementation by a Steering Committee, or (2) implementation by a restructured PAME with mandate to propose pollution prevention measures within both the marine and terrestrial ecosystems – i.e. create a working group on Protection of the Arctic Environment (PAE).

It was noted that collaboration with the SDP could be (a) through assigning relevant SDP projects to CAFF, or (b) through participation in SDP meetings and workshop. Both approaches have drawbacks and will create extra financial and resource burdens on CAFF. A question was posed if a central fund and a clearing house mechanism (as proposed by the WG Chair’s meeting) should be established to ensure WG involvement in, or implementation of, SDP activities where appropriate. It was further noted that SDP projects currently get higher

## Draft Minutes

SAO attention than do WG projects due to scheduling of SDP meetings immediately before SAO meetings and that this might create a profile imbalance with respect to Arctic Council projects.

The Executive Secretary posed the question whether CAFF should start pursuing development of Arctic Council Biodiversity Strategy to elevate the biodiversity issue up to the SAO level. Participants were of the opinion that CAFF's current "Strategic Plan for the Conservation of Arctic Biodiversity" was sufficient. However, the biodiversity element should be a part of any sustainable development strategy as well as any overall action plan developed by the Arctic Council. The Chair urged countries to raise these issues with their respective SAOs.

*Participants agreed that there is currently some confusion and uncertainty regarding CAFF role in relation to ACAP and SDP and that it is important to clarify these organisational issues. Participants noted that this was not only an issue for CAFF and should preferably be dealt with through the WG Chair's venue or bilaterally with AMAP. The meeting agreed that CAFF would approach AMAP and propose a joint response to some of these issues.*

### 7. Brief orientation on program progress and status

- **Sacred Sites.** IPS reported that the initial project proposal has not been approved by RAIPON and that a new proposal is being developed in collaboration with CAFF Secretariat and DEPA (Danish Environmental Protection Agency), which still remains interested in funding the project. A draft of the new proposal was distributed.
- **Biodiversity Workshop.** Iceland noted that the workshop had developed several recommendations and launched 6 voluntary expert networks (on Arctic char, reindeer/caribou, ringed seals, Arctic waders, seabirds and vegetation/ITEX). Terms of Reference for the network coordinators were distributed. The coordinators will report on their findings to CAFF VIII. CAFF VIII also needs to revisit the recommendations from the workshop.
- **CPAN ad hoc Standing Committee.** The US noted that five countries were currently represented in the Committee. A letter has been sent out to countries, seeking views on tasks to be performed to move CPAN ahead. Countries have until June 19 to respond.

Russia reiterated that Stanislav Belikov will be the Russian representative on the CPAN ad hoc committee. Sune Sohlberg will be the Swedish representative for the time being.

Norway noted that a detailed progress information on CPAN had been received from seven countries with Iceland still missing and that this information could form the basis for a progress report to Ministers, although initially intended for the CAFF Overview report.

- **Flora Group.** USA reported that the flora group is fully formed and that a letter has been sent out to all countries seeking their views on flora issues that should be dealt with by CAFF.
- **Pan-Arctic Protected Areas Registry (PAPAR).** Norway is preparing a new proposal for the structure and organisation of the PAPAR database. It is now

## Draft Minutes

proposed that the PAPAR will include all types of protected areas as well as management areas. The model used is the Emerald Network of the European Union. The proposal will be presented at CAFF VIII. Once finalised and accepted, a request will go out to countries for information.

Participants emphasised that including temporary management areas demanded careful thinking and recommended close links with the CPAN *ad hoc* Committee.

- **Migratory Bird Workshop.** The Executive Secretary informed that the workshop had been postponed due to several unforeseen reasons and that the current intention was to have hold it in Trondheim, September 4-5, back to back with CAFF VIII. *[Note: this has turned out to be impossible due to conflicts with key persons. The organisers are currently considering Trondheim, September 10-11, but no decision has been reached].*
- **Gap Analysis.** The Executive Secretary noted that the map and report had been delivered to the Secretariat, but that the text had not passed quality control, since it was extremely technical and short on the interpretation side. The project team had decided that the best approach would be to prepare an extended summary in layman language, highlighting the project findings and relating the work to CPAN.
- **Marine Paper.** Canada informed that the report will be edited once more by Canada and then sent to the Secretariat for printing.

## 8. Secretariat

The Secretariat distributed a report on Secretariat activities.

### Budget

#### CLOSED CAFF NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES' MEETING

Main conclusions were that:

- The Chair/Secretariat shall insure financial contributions from countries well in advance of upcoming fiscal years (the Secretariat uses the calendar year as a fiscal year).
- The Secretariat shall base its projected expenses (prospectus) on guaranteed income only.
- The Secretariat needs to provide more detailed operating and budget statements, detailing funds and time spent on each project.
- In light of the different fiscal years used by Arctic countries, the Secretariat shall prepare monthly budget updates.
- The Secretariat should request 5% overhead for managing externally funded projects.

*The Secretariat will prepare and circulate to the National Representatives for approval, a revised budget statement based following an outline provided by Canada.*

## 9. Overview Report

The Chair reviewed the status of the report and informed that the Editorial Team had come up with several options for how to report on progress at the Ministerial, including providing them with a draft with the main text much reduced and emphasising graphics and information boxes. However, the bottom line was that the Editorial Team could not guarantee a final draft

## Draft Minutes

at the Ministerial meeting. Also, according to the Editorial Team's judgment it would be impossible anyway to deliver a full "status and trends" report within the budget and timeline provided. The Chair further emphasised that it would be important for CAFF's credibility to deliver a final product of some sort to the Ministers and that this meeting should define what that product could be.

A participants quoted a harsh critique by a reviewer of one of the draft chapters in the report and cautioned against rushing the process. This view was supported by several countries. The Executive Secretary informed that other reviewers had been generally very positive, although the overall opinion was that the current draft text is too general and weak on the actual status and trends information.

The Executive Secretary further noted that the timeline and budget had always been very tight and had relied on full cooperation and facilitation by the countries. Also, that the intention had never been to produce a full "state of the environment report" on Arctic biodiversity and therefore the initial title had been rather unfortunate.

Participants discussed several options for the Ministerial meeting given the current status, including:

- delivering a presentation package of the available draft;
- deliver one or two final chapters;
- producing a printed brochure with key information that will give the Ministers and indication of what to expect.

The meeting decided that:

*CAFF shall deliver a stand alone product – in a brochure format – to the Ministers. The brochure is to be a compilation of some key status and trends data (graphics, tables, maps and information boxes) with a written text relating this information to major concerns facing Arctic biodiversity. The Product should be 20-40 pages, printed in nice layout and colours. The Editorial Team shall make an effort to prepare the brochure within the currently available budget. If need demands, Canada offered to devote the \$ 20 000 US, originally set aside for printing the Overview Report, to this process. Greenland offered to assist the Editorial Team in shaping the product and in additional fundraising if need be.*

*The Editorial Team is directed to come up with a proposal (work plan) for how the brochure can be finalised by September 15, 2000, including an outline, budget and timetable. For the deadline to hold, a good draft must be sent out to countries no later than by the first week of August.*

*The CAFF Secretariat shall prioritise this work and the CAFF National Representatives commit to facilitate the process, including identifying key information.*

*CAFF VIII will consider how and when the larger Overview Report will be completed..*

## **10. Follow-up on the Circumpolar Marine Workshop (CMW)**

The printed workshop report was distributed at and acknowledged by the meeting.

Participants noted that the IUCN/CAFF/PAME workshop had generated many recommendations, some of which were clearly relevant to CAFF's mandate. However, the countries had not had the time to consider the recommendations properly. Canada and Iceland offered to review the CMW recommendations and prepare a list of the ones they considered of most relevance to CAFF.

## Draft Minutes

*The meeting acknowledged the offer from Canada and Iceland to review the CMW recommendations and to prepare an annotated priority list for consideration by CAFF VIII. [Note: no deadline was set, but for this to be beneficial for CAFF VIII, the Secretariat will need the list by August 1, 2000, the latest]*

Some participants raised concerns about the organisation of the workshop. However, they were of the opinion that CMW was an effort that deserved mentioning in the Ministerial Declaration, although, at present, CAFF is not ready to propose specific work plan item(s), for the upcoming inter-ministerial period, related to the workshop themes.

*The meeting decided to collaborate with PAME on suggesting a paragraph for the Ministerial Declaration acknowledging the CMW and welcoming CAFF and PAME's intention to consider and process the recommendations further.*

On a related note, ICC suggested that CAFF considered the IUCN Resolution on the Arctic and the accompanying IUCN Arctic Strategy which is under development.

## 11. Preparations for CAFF VIII and the Ministerial Meeting

### CAFF VIII

The Chair informed that CAFF VIII was relocated to Trondheim (September 6-8, 2000) due to economic reasons. Practical arrangements are settled in Trondheim and an excursion is being planned on Saturday the 9<sup>th</sup> of September. A draft agenda will be developed shortly and sent out to countries. The Chair asked participants for advice regarding the structure of the meeting (i.e. full plenary, breakout sessions, mixture) and agenda items.

Participants were of the opinion that more time was needed for plenary discussions than was the case in Yellowknife and suggested the following agenda items (in no particular order):

- Overview Report – process for completing the main report
- Circumpolar Marine Workshop – discussion of recommendations, based on priority list prepared by Canada and Iceland.
- CPAN – report and recommendations from the *ad hoc* Committee and discussion.
- Flora Group – report and recommendations.
- Follow up on other recommendations from Yellowknife
- ACIA – progress and CAFF input.
- Biodiversity Monitoring – workshop recommendations and reports from networks.
- Bycatch Report – follow-up.
- GEF Project – focus of discussion will depend on support from GEF.
- IUCN's Arctic Strategy and Nordic Council of Ministers Arctic Action Plan – relationship/collaboration with CAFF.

Canada inquired about the next Circumpolar Seabird Working Group Meeting. Iceland informed that Finland is considering hosting it fall of 2000.

### Preparations for Ministerial

The Executive Secretary informed that the WGs are waiting for Ministerial reporting guidelines from the Arctic Council Secretariat.

The meeting suggested the following deliverables from CAFF to the Ministers:

## Draft Minutes

- Overview brochure.
- Atlas of Rare Endemic Vascular Plants of the Arctic.
- GEF PDF-A report and progress on the PDF-B (if financed by that time).
- Workshop Reports (Circumpolar Marine Workshop, Biodiversity Workshop, Bycatch Workshop).
- Technical Reports: Gap Analysis, CPAN Marine Report, Seabird Harvest Report.
- Progress Report on CPAN.

Participants discussed potential messages that CAFF should try to highlight in the Ministerial Declaration. The following issues were tentatively suggested: Overview Report, biodiversity monitoring, ACIA, GEF Project, marine issues in collaboration with PAME, CPAN, Flora issues.

*The meeting agreed that the Chair and Secretariat, upon receipt of guidelines from the Arctic Council Secretariat, draft a proposal on progress reporting and messages to Ministers.*

## 12. CAFF Operating Guidelines/Communications Strategy

The Executive Secretary informed that he had reviewed both documents and suggested some changes to the draft Operating Guidelines to make them more consistent with current operating policies of CAFF. He had no substantial comments on the draft Communications Strategy.

Russia noted that the Communications Strategy could be more informative as a procedural document for the Secretariat. ICC noted that there is a need for a Presentation material for CAFF and in fact the Arctic Council as a whole (e.g. PowerPoint, overhead package).

*Countries will comment both documents no later than September 1, 2000 [Note: The Secretariat proposes comments by August 15, 2000, so that the final document is ready at CAFF VIII].*

Participants discussed publication of these documents.

*The meeting agreed to print the Operating Guidelines and the Communications Strategy together in one document and in small quantity for internal use.*

## 13. Next Management Board meeting

The Chair proposed September 5 in Trondheim. Some participants noted conflict with the Migratory Bird Workshop. The Chair offered to consider and consult with other representatives through Email.

*[Note: Since the Migratory Bird Workshop will not be held on September 4-5, the Chair's proposal for September 5 in Trondheim is still valid, pending confirmation]*

## 14. Any Other Business

Norway informed that WWF-Arctic has made a tentative offer to CAFF to produce a book on CPAN, with illustrations and information on the various Arctic protected areas.

Norway also reiterated GRID-Arendal's offer to assist CAFF in preparing a professional presentation (PowerPoint/overheads) on the program.

## 15. Close.



## **Draft Minutes**

The meeting was ajourned at 17:30 on May 9, 2000

**CAFF Heads of Delegation Meeting,  
Copenhagen, May 8-10, 2000**

**Revised Draft Agenda**

**MAY 8**

**10:00 (1) Welcome.**

**10:05 (2) SAO Highlights**

Secretariat/Chairs report on CAFF relevant highlights from the Fairbanks WG Chairs' and SAO meetings.

**10:30 (3) CAFF Chairmanship.**

**10:45 (4) Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA)**

- a. Terms of Reference for the Assessment Steering Committee (ASC).
- b. Additional CAFF representative to the ASC.
- c. Appointment of Lead-authors and financial implications.

Draft 3.4 of the ACIA Implementation Plan, which will be submitted to the SAOs in Fairbanks, has been circulated to the CAFF NRs/PPs. It is also available on the CAFF website: <http://www.grida.no/caff>. CAFF needs to review and adopt the Terms of Reference for the ASC, identify a second CAFF member for the ASC (currently the CAFF Executive Secretary serves this role), and discuss appointment of lead-authors and financial implications.

**12:00-13:30 Lunch**

**13:30 (5) GEF Project.**

- a. Status
- b. Briefing of GEF Contacts by CAFF National Representatives
- c. Involvement by other CAFF countries and co-financing

At the moment of writing it is unclear whether the GEF/PDF-B has been financed or not [*GEF Secretariat decision is expected on May 12*]. In case it has, there is a need for discussion among countries on *in kind* and financial contribution to the project.

**14:15 (6) ACAP, SDP and CAFF.**

Norway intends to finalise the Arctic Council Action Plan (ACAP) for approval by Ministers this fall. At present its implementation, as well as its effect on the work of CAFF and other WGs is unclear. The Secretariat will circulate relevant information to the National Representatives.

The Sustainable Development Program already lists projects (Saami fisheries projects) that touch the mandate of CAFF. Norway has sponsored several workshops under the SD headline, including on sustainable marine fisheries and reindeer

## Draft Minutes

herding. CAFF should consider these developments and if there is a potential for cooperation.

There is a pressure on the AC to develop a Sustainable Development Strategy or framework. CAFF should consider if there is a need to Develop an Arctic Council Strategy/Action Plan for Biodiversity, i.e. as a follow-up to the Overview Report.

### **15:30 Coffee break**

## **CLOSED CAFF NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES' MEETING**

### **16:00 (7) Secretariat.**

a. Budget and report

Review/adoption of Budget and Operational Statement.

b. Management structure and responsibilities

Several things are unclear regarding the legal status of the Secretariat and its management structure - a clearer division of responsibilities between the National Representatives and the Executive Secretary would be desirable.

-----

## **MAY 9**

### **08:30 (8) CAFF Overview Report**

- a. Status of Text and Graphics (report from Cambridge)
- b. Status of Finances
- c. Recommendations

One of the main objectives of the meeting should be to finalise a draft Conclusions and Recommendations Chapter for the Overview Report for circulation to the SAOs. The Secretariat together with the EDs will prepare a working draft based on the outline circulated last week of March and inputs received from countries.

### **10:00 Coffee break**

### **10:30 (9) CAFF Overview Report, cont.**

### **12:00 Lunch**

### **13:30 (10) Follow-up to the Circumpolar Marine Workshop**

The Report from the CMW is expected in early April. CAFF needs to consider its recommendations and eventual follow-up process.

### **14:00 (11) Preparations for CAFF VIII and the Ministerial Meeting**

- a. CAFF VIII - Status of preparations, development of a draft agenda.
- b. Directions from the SAOs re: Ministerial meeting.
- c. Deliverables to the Ministers.

## Draft Minutes

- d. Messages that CAFF wants highlighted in the Ministerial Declaration (see also 3).

**15:00 Coffee break**

**15:30 (12) CAFF Operating Guidelines/Communications Strategy**

**16:00 (13) Brief orientation on status of other CAFF projects**

- Sacred Sites Project/IPS
- Biodiversity workshop/Iceland
- CPAN ad hoc committee/USA
- Flora group/USA
- PAPAR/Norway
- Gap analysis/Secretariat
- Marine paper/Canada

**17:30 (18) Any Other Business.**