

CONSERVATION OF ARCTIC FLORA AND FAUNA

**Sixth Annual Meeting of the CAFF International
Working Group**

CAFF VI

Summary Report

Nuuk, Greenland

September 27-30, 1997

Prepared by the CAFF International Secretariat 1998

Table of Contents

Executive Summary ii

Introduction 4

Agenda item 1: Welcome and Opening Address 4

Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda 4

Agenda Item 3: Opening Statements 4

Agenda Item 4: Report from Alta: Directions by SAOs and Ministers 7

Agenda Item 5: Review of 1996-1997 Work Plan Activities 8

1. Habitat Conservation 8
2. Flora Conservation 9

3. Fauna Conservation10
4. Biodiversity Conservation11
5. Integration of Indigenous Peoples12
6. Associated Projects12

Agenda Item 6; Report from the Workshop on Circumpolar Arctic Nature Conservation 13

Agenda Item 7: Development of the Long -Term Action Plan 14

1. Report from *Ad Hoc* Group on Sustainable Use of Arctic Renewable Resources14
2. Report of the Analytical Group14
3. Report from *Ad Hoc* Group on the Long-term Action Plan15
4. Reports from Discussion Groups on Priority Objectives15
5. Plenary Discussion on the Reports of the Discussion Groups17
6. Proposals Pertaining to Future Activities17

Agenda Item 8: Management Issues 18

1. United States' White Paper on Procedures18
2. Review and Approval of Project Proposals18
3. Plenary Discussion on Management Issues19
4. Report from *Ad Hoc* Group on Program Management19
5. Report of the Chair20
6. Report of the CAFF Secretariat20

Agenda Item 9: Planning Ahead 21

1. Preparation of the 1997-98 CAFF Work Plan21
2. Work Plan Development21
3. Future Annual Meetings22

Agenda Item 10: Recommendations to SAOs and Ministers 22

Agenda Item 11: Other Business 22

Agenda Item 12: Close of Meeting 22

Appendix I: CAFF Participants List 23

Appendix II: Report from *Ad hoc* Group on Sustainable Use 28

Appendix III: Outline of CAFF Strategic Plan 29

Appendix IV: Reports of Discussion Groups on Priority Objectives 31

Appendix V: Proposals to Improve the Efficiency of CAFF 35

Appendix VI: CAFF Work Plan 1997-98 38

Executive Summary

The Sixth Annual Meeting of the CAFF Working Group (CAFF VI) was held in Nuuk, Greenland from September 27-30, 1997 and attended by all eight Arctic countries, the ICC, RAIPON, the Netherlands, the UK, the IUCN, UNEP, WCMC and WWF. It was chaired by Peter Nielsen, outgoing Chair of CAFF.

The meeting was opened by Marianna Jensen, Greenland's Minister of Health, Environment and Research who stated that Greenland, and its majority indigenous population, is committed to environmental protection. Her presentation was followed by statements on priorities for CAFF from the eight Arctic countries. Developing CAFF's Strategic Plan, implementing its approved strategies (CPAN, Murre, Eider) and fulfilling Ministerial priorities were consistently highlighted. RAIPON expressed a hope that CAFF and RAIPON could work with the Russian scientific community to build a useful network and the ICC pointed to the need to increase public awareness of CAFF and to include the views of local people and communities in its work. The observer countries and organisations brought various messages of support and encouragement for continued co-operation.

An important message was the report of the Chair on directions given to CAFF from the SAAO's and Ministers. They had accepted the CAFF products presented to them at Alta and had assigned priorities which included implementing approved strategies, completing other projects and developing the CAFF Strategic Plan. An additional priority was for CAFF to "outline ideas and proposals for the conservation and sustainable use of Arctic renewable resources". This proved contentious and unachievable during the meeting because it touched on CAFF's as-yet undefined future role and functions within the new Arctic Council and its relationship to the Council's sustainable development initiative whose functions remain undefined despite lengthy

effort to reach consensus at the SAAO and SAO level. As CAFF's incoming Chair, Kevin McCormick summed it up: the present period is both a time of uncertainty and opportunity for the CAFF program

*Reports indicated that CAFF made good progress on its 1996-97 Work Plan. Under **Habitat Conservation**, CAFF completed an initial Progress Report on CPAN, delivered a draft CPAN Implementation Reporting and Evaluation Guide, an annotated outline for a paper on marine protection, a discussion paper on a Pan-Arctic Protected Areas Registry (PAPAR), a Global Overview of the Conservation of Migratory Birds Outside the Arctic, and a status report on its ice-edge project which shows thinning of the ice-pack and delayed freeze-ups in Russia's Arctic.*

*CAFF has made good headway in **Flora Conservation** with the completion of its Atlas of Rare Endemic Vascular Plants of the Arctic now being readied for publication, numerous additions to its list of non-endemic Arctic plants of common concern, production of the first maps (relief, greenness, infrared) from its Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Map project (CAVM) and considerable progress on its Pan-Arctic Flora Check List.*

*In **Fauna Conservation**, CAFF is implementing its Murre Strategy and is making plans to do the same for its Eider Strategy. Reports on seabird harvest, incidental mortality of seabirds and human disturbance at seabird colonies are soon to be published as CAFF technical reports and the next edition of the Circumpolar Seabird Bulletin is in preparation. The Circumpolar Seabird Working Group (CSWG) is considering reassessing its priorities to make certain its efforts are focused where they are most needed.*

*Under **Biodiversity Conservation**, CAFF delivered the final Co-operative Strategy for the Conservation of Biological Diversity in the Arctic Region to Ministers who approved its use as an overall framework for CAFF's conservation efforts. The paper on Threats to Arctic Biodiversity will be given to the SAO's in early 1998 and the delayed report on biodiversity monitoring is forthcoming.*

*CAFF has completed all its projects under **Integration of Indigenous Peoples** and the many recommendations now need to be "operationalised". The ICC has proposed providing CAFF with specific proposals on implementing the various recommendations. Participants reiterated that integration of indigenous knowledge remains a CAFF*

priority and the IPS Secretariat offered to work with CAFF on a framework for that purpose.

*Two of CAFF's 1996-97 **Associated Projects** were withdrawn - the CD-ROM of circumpolar maps and GIS information (GRID-Arendal) and the Conservation Atlas for the Arctic (WWF). However, the project on a Terrestrial Migratory Species Database is proceeding well.*

CAFF accepted several proposals for additional work, including: (1) a IUCN Associated Project for a Circumpolar Case Study on Arctic Tourism in Relation to Protected Areas (CPAN) (2) a Finnish project on Northern Timberline Forests, (3) a RAIPON project to examine the inclusion of sacred lands and graveyards of indigenous people in the establishment of protected areas and CPAN, and (4) Iceland's proposal to initiate work on a CAFF communications strategy.

The meeting received a report on a Workshop on Circumpolar Arctic Nature Conservation held just prior to CAFF VI in which the participants concluded that CAFF's major strength is that it is a working group, that its major weakness is lack of funding or funding imbalance and that two ways to improve the program are e.g. to adopt a communications strategy and develop a CAFF "State of the Arctic Environment Report". The workshop also provided substantial recommendations for CAFF's Strategic Plan.

During the meeting, an ad hoc group was formed to respond to the Ministerial instruction to "outline ideas and proposals regarding the conservation and sustainable use of Arctic renewable resources". This proved impossible because of differing views on whether or not such a task is timely, given the uncertainty surrounding CAFF's role in the Arctic Council and the role of the Council's sustainable development program. Nevertheless, the group proposed three ways for CAFF to contribute: by evaluating the sustainability of proposed projects, by facilitating compilation of needed additional data and by developing procedures to monitor long-term sustainability of projects and review results.

*Much of the meeting was devoted to developing CAFF's long-term **Strategic Plan**. This followed a report by the Analytical Group which delivered a framework to assist in the task and identified five of the fourteen Biodiversity Strategy objectives as priorities for*

CAFF. The meeting broke into five groups to propose action items under each of the objectives (Monitoring, Species Conservation, Protected Areas, Conservation Outside Protected Areas and Socio-economic Considerations/Sectoral Integration). All five developed proposed actions to include in the draft Strategic Plan, scheduled for completion after the meeting and after extensive review.

In Plenary, participants made several general observations about the program:

- *CAFF needs to focus more on raising the profile and public awareness of Arctic conservation issues and CAFF and be more visible to decision makers.*
- *CAFF needs to recognise that socio-economic decisions are made at all levels and by differing types of people.*
- *CAFF needs to be proactive, not just a passive provider of information.*
- *CAFF needs to emphasise the socio-economic value of Arctic biodiversity.*

The meeting also dealt with management and procedural aspects of the CAFF program and developed a draft procedures document, based on papers submitted by Canada and the US, for presentation to the SAO's. Both the outgoing Chair, Peter Nielsen, and the CAFF Executive Secretary, Snorri Baldursson, delivered their reports and highlighted the program's successes with the SAO's and Ministers and pointed out the need for additional finances, for a strengthened Secretariat and for some countries to respond more promptly and thoroughly to requests from the Secretariat.

*The final task of participants was to draft the **1997-98 CAFF Work Plan** to carry CAFF through to, at minimum, September 1998 when the program will be formally absorbed into the Arctic Council and faces an uncertain future.*

The meeting was adjourned with the outgoing Chair, Peter Nielsen, turning the reins over to his successor, Kevin McCormick of Canada, incoming Chair of CAFF.

Introduction

The Sixth Annual Meeting of the CAFF Working Group (CAFF VI) took place in Nuuk, Greenland, from September 27-30, 1997. It was attended by representatives of the eight

Arctic countries, Permanent Participants from Russia and the Inuit Circumpolar Conference and by representatives of the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, the IUCN, UNEP, WCMC and WWF. In addition to the meeting, participants were treated to a marine excursion along coastal fjords and to a reception and dinner hosted by the Ministry of Environment and Nature and CAFF.

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Opening Address by Host Country

Peter Nielsen, CAFF Chair, welcomed participants and introduced Marianna Jensen, Minister for Health, Environment and Research in the Greenland Home Rule Government. *Marianna Jensen* welcomed delegates and explained that Greenland sees the protection and sustainable use of Arctic flora and fauna as a very important task and that its interest and involvement in CAFF, for which it has autonomy, has been increasing. She pointed out that in Greenland, the indigenous populations are not a minority and have not faced the same struggles as elsewhere. She expressed gratitude for this, but cautioned that with this freedom come responsibilities for the environment. Greenland is meeting these by e.g. a new building for the Institute for Natural Resources, establishing a full Department of Environment, and by giving prominence to matters of the environment and nature in the new coalition government. Hopefully, these steps will place the Greenlanders in a good position to protect the environment. The will to do so certainly exists.

Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Agenda Item 3: Opening Statements

Canada

Kevin McCormick noted that the present period was both a time of uncertainty and opportunity for the program. In the fall of 1998, CAFF will be fully integrated with the Arctic Council (AC) whose mandate includes sustainable development. For Canada, sustainable development refers to "the link between the social and economic forces, policy decisions, and the carrying capacity of the environment. Mr. McCormick stated

that the SAOs (Senior Arctic Officials) have requested CAFF to take a more focused approach and that the action plan for the *Cooperative Strategy* to be developed further by this meeting would attempt to do so. It would serve as the compass by which to navigate within the Council for the next few years. Mr. McCormick was confident that with co-operation and hard work the meeting would succeed in developing such a plan.

Finland

Paula Kankaanpää stated that the main objective of this meeting was to take the next step from the *Cooperative Strategy* towards a more detailed long-term action plan to lead CAFF in the years ahead. CAFF should show interest in the AC sustainable development work by providing direct input and by explaining that sustainable development and conservation are tightly linked. With respect to CAFF's future work, Finland is mainly interested in work on forest and freshwater issues. Two wider issues are also especially relevant: Arctic biodiversity monitoring and increasing public awareness and education about the importance of Arctic biodiversity.

Iceland

Ævar Petersen stated that Iceland considers completing the Analytical Group's work on the development of the long-term action plan for the *Cooperative Strategy* as the most important work to be done in the months ahead. The document needs to be in constant evolution. The CAFF program is an ambitious one and it needs to be so. The profile of CAFF needs to be raised and the Secretariat needs to be strengthened to get the work done.

Norway

Berit Lein considered it most important for CAFF to fulfil the Ministerial requests from Alta with respect to the Circumpolar Protected Areas Network (CPAN), the *Eider* and *Murre* strategies, and the long-term action plan for biodiversity conservation in the Arctic. Next, CAFF should increase its efforts to conserve habitats outside protected areas. CAFF should compile a report on principles and mechanisms for land-use planning in the eight countries, re-examine the work done on threats to Arctic biodiversity to concentrate efforts where they are most needed, and ensure that CAFF's concerns are integrated into the Arctic Council's sustainable development work through the important issue of sector integration. She concluded by informing the meeting that Norway had completed its national program for biodiversity monitoring.

Russia

Vladimir Pisheliev brought greetings from Amirkhan Amirkhanov Russia's CAFF National Representative. He observed that CAFF had done good work in the last year which had been applauded by the Russian Minister in Alta. He pointed out that the work of the Analytical Group is a good basis for CAFF's long-term action plan and that the results from the Karrebæksminde Workshop (see Agenda item 6) should be incorporated as well. Russia's priorities for CAFF are conservation of the genetic resources of the Arctic, i.e. rare and endangered and especially economically important species; conservation outside protected areas and the development of a habitat conservation strategy; implementation and further development of CPAN; and the development of a bio-monitoring system using CPAN and local flora as a basis. Finally, Mr Pisheliev expressed his sincere thanks to those who supported the participation of the Russian delegation at CAFF VI.

Sweden

Christer Borgh explained that CAFF work has a low profile in Sweden but that the CAFF program is important for conservation work in northern Sweden, especially in relation to the Lapponian World Heritage Area. The economic situation in Sweden is improving and there are hopes for more funds to be allocated to CAFF in coming years. Sweden is also waiting to see what comes out of the discussions about the Arctic Council.

The United States (US)

Janet Hohn stated that the CAFF program has attracted attention in the US as a model of international co-operation on conservation issues in the Arctic. Six federal agencies, the State of Alaska, nine non-governmental organisations, and four Alaskan native organisations participate in CAFF. She informed that good progress is being made on US-led CAFF projects on vegetation, ice edge mapping and seabird conservation and that copies of four maps from the vegetation mapping project, the rare plants Atlas and a CD with maps would be distributed. To further its goals, CAFF should make a major effort to implement its strategies (*Biodiversity, Eider and Murre, CPAN*). Ms. Hohn concluded by noting that although funding for CAFF activities continues to be an issue, the US remains committed to the CAFF program.

Russian Association for Indigenous Peoples of the North (RAIPON)

Sergei Haruchi stressed the importance of CAFF's work, but noted that although the Indigenous Peoples are ready to share their skills and knowledge of Arctic flora, fauna and habitats, RAIPON has so far not been very active for a number of reasons, the main one being the language barrier. There is a lack of translation of important documents for the Indigenous Peoples to familiarise themselves with the environmental issues being discussed so that they can participate constructively in the process. Another difficulty has been insufficient co-operation with the Russian scientific community. Mr. Haruchi further proposed that CAFF work with the Russian scientific community and RAIPON to build a "network for co-operation, information exchange, training and education".

Inuit Circumpolar Conference (ICC)

Alfred Jacobsen hoped that this meeting could define CAFF's role in the Arctic Council. He asked delegates to remember that people live in the Arctic and are dependent on the natural resources that are being conserved. Mr. Jacobsen stressed the importance of increasing the public awareness about CAFF and the need to always include the views of local people and communities in its work. In that connection he cited a recently signed agreement between the ICC and the Organisation of Hunters and Fishermen in Greenland which is intended to help inform people about the international work of ICC and also to promote the views of the hunters within ICC.

The Netherlands

Gerard Boere reconfirmed the Netherlands' commitment to CAFF and to Arctic conservation in general. He mentioned three projects of interest supported by the Dutch Program for International Co-operation: A soon to be signed contract with WWF to support Russia in creating nine new protected areas in the Arctic; a major wetlands and waterfowl conservation program in West Africa; and the continuing support of the Interim Secretariat of the African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement, which is considered a major tool for the conservation of Arctic birds outside the Arctic.

The United Kingdom (UK)

In his address *William Oliver Heal* noted that an important part of the United Kingdom's conservation efforts is directly concerned with Arctic flora and fauna, i.e. through migratory birds, marine mammals, and Arctic-alpine flora species many of which are at their southern distribution limits in the UK and in a need of conservation effort. Mr. Heal noted that the UK welcomed a continued connection to CAFF.

United Nations' Environment Program: GRID-Arendal (UNEP GRID-Arendal)

David Henry explained that several international initiatives with which UNEP is working have relevance to CAFF and offered UNEP's assistance whenever possible. He noted that UNEP supported the Karrebæksminde Workshop (see Agenda item 6) and hoped it would be useful in developing CAFF's long-term action plan. He further mentioned UNEP GRID-Arendal's hosting of CAFF's website and assistance with developing a registry for CPAN. Mr. Henry stressed that CAFF should consider developing a communications strategy and re-examine its information collection, storage and dissemination processes.

World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)

Peter Prokosch mentioned the Karrebæksminde workshop (see Agenda item 6) as a means to support the development of CAFF. He noted that the WWF would like to see a more proactive CAFF program in the future, and encouraged the working group to make a proposal to the SAOs with respect to CAFF's role in the Arctic Council rather than waiting for their decisions. He further reconfirmed WWF's interest in continuing as one of CAFF's non-governmental partners in conservation work in the Arctic.

World Conservation and Monitoring Centre (WCMC)

Christoph Zöckler informed the meeting that WCMC's focus in the Arctic in recent years had been on projects related to the CAFF program. WCMC considers CAFF a good example of international work that could be carried over to other ecosystems and ecozones. WCMC would like to continue supporting CAFF, in particular its gap analysis work with Russia.

World Conservation Union (IUCN)

John Waugh informed the meeting that the IUCN is a global conservation union in which all CAFF countries and many of the observers are members and that it was pleased to accept the invitation to attend CAFF's annual meeting. He stated that the IUCN was bringing an important proposal to CAFF to collaborate on a project on Arctic tourism in relation to protected areas and that CAFF had been a major player in preparing the Arctic component of the IUCN's *Report on a Global System of Marine Protected Areas*. He hoped to discuss co-operation with CAFF on implementing it in the Arctic.

Agenda Item 4: Report from Alta - Directions by SAOs and Ministers

The Chair observed that since the last Annual Meeting (CAFF V in Rovaniemi), there had been three SAAO (Senior Arctic Affairs Officials) meetings of the AEPS, two SAO (Senior Arctic Officials) meetings of the Arctic Council and one Ministerial Conference. His main impression from these meetings was that CAFF's work has been appreciated and that the general support for the program was increasing. There is also a growing understanding of the necessity to strengthen the Secretariat. As a first step in that direction the Icelandic Government has offered an additional 40,000 USD towards the expense of hiring another staff member.

In Alta the Ministers welcomed the following CAFF products:

- *Co-operative Strategy for the Conservation of Biological Diversity in the Arctic Region.*
- *CPAN Progress Report 1997.*
- *Circumpolar Eider Conservation Strategy and Action Plan;* and
- *CAFF Report to SAAOs 1997.*

In its *Report to SAAOs 1997*, CAFF included "Recommendations on the Integration of Two Ways of Knowing: Traditional Indigenous Knowledge and Scientific Knowledge", and a report on the implementation of the *Murre Strategy*.

Mr. Nielsen stated that CAFF's wish to use the *Cooperative Strategy* as a basis for its future work had been accepted and that the Ministers had assigned CAFF the following priorities to pursue until the 1998 Conference of the Ministers:

- Continue developing and implementing CPAN.
- Assist countries to implement the *Murre* and *Eider* strategies.
- Finish other ongoing projects as feasible and appropriate.
- Outline ideas and proposals for the conservation and sustainable use of Arctic renewable resources.
- Develop a long-term action plan to give effect to the *Co-operative Strategy for the Conservation of Biological Diversity in the Arctic Region*.

With respect to outlining ideas on the sustainable use of Arctic renewable resources, the *Chair* proposed that an *ad hoc* group be formed at the meeting to suggest how CAFF should respond to this priority. There was much discussion on the role and mandate of this *ad hoc* group. The *US* position was that CAFF should not produce any official statement on sustainable use and development pending completion of the SAO discussion on terms of reference for the AC sustainable development initiative. However, the US did not object to forming a group to discuss the issue for the benefit of the meeting. *Others* were of the impression that the SAOs had requested ideas and proposals and that it was important that CAFF's points of view were fed into their discussions at an early point. The *decision* was to form the small *ad hoc* group to provide the Plenary with a discussion base and ideas on how to proceed. (See below under Agenda Item 7, Report from *Ad Hoc* Group)

Agenda Item 5: Review of 1996 -1997 Work plan Activities

Facilitators were used to provide reports of work plan activities under the topics of habitat conservation, flora conservation, fauna conservation, biodiversity conservation, integration of indigenous people and associated projects.

5.1 Habitat Conservation (Work Items 1.1, 1.3) - *Facilitator*: Finn Katerås, Norway

Finn Katerås led the plenary through the Work Plan items under Habitat Conservation with assistance from project leaders as appropriate. A summary of the presentations follows.

Circumpolar Protected Areas Network - CPAN

A progress report on CPAN implementation (1.1.i) was successfully developed by the Secretariat and delivered to the Ministers.

The *Secretariat* tabled a draft *CPAN Implementation Reporting and Evaluation Guide* (1.1.ii) which provides a structured framework to simplify the CPAN reporting process and quantify results. Consistent with the *CPAN Strategy and Action Plan*, it is in three parts. Part A - "National Implementation Reporting Guide" is to be used by the countries to report on CPAN actions at the national level. Part B - "International (AEPS level) Implementation Reporting Guide", is to be used by an assigned body to report on actions to be taken at the AEPS level. Part C - an overall "Evaluation Guide" is to be used to track and assess overall progress. The *Executive Secretary* noted that the Guide allows countries considerable discretion as to the extent of reporting and likened much of it to a "multiple choice" examination. Delegates were concerned that, at first glance, the process called for might be too detailed and time-consuming but agreed that if completed properly, it would yield much valuable information. It was *decided* that the countries would submit comments to the Secretariat by December 1997.

Russia reported that several unsuccessful attempts had been made to finance a comprehensive gap analysis in support of CPAN implementation (1.1.iii) but stressed the importance of continuing this work. *Mr Katerås* and others suggested that perhaps it might be reasonable to divide the project into smaller components and start with e.g. a limited regional analysis.

On marine protected areas (1.1.iv), *Canada* explained that it had circulated an annotated outline of the discussion paper called for at Rovaniemi but that its scope had been reduced at the National Representatives/Permanent Participants (NR/PP) meeting in Akureyri. A new outline was circulated and the paper now under development will: (1) summarise the jurisdictional responsibilities for marine ecosystems; (2) discuss options for the protection and maintenance of marine ecosystems; and (3) discuss options for establishment of marine conservation areas. There was a strong *consensus* about the importance of this work item and support for its continuation. Collaboration with the IUCN was suggested and *Canada* proposed that a group discussion be held jointly with IUCN and others on how to proceed.

Norway in co-operation with GRID-Arendal submitted a discussion paper on the structure and function of a Pan-Arctic Protected Areas Registry - PAPAR (1.1.v). The paper sets out some basic suggestions and ideas and explains how such a registry links with e.g. WCMC's initiative to develop a directory of Arctic protected areas. The

meeting was informed that Norway and UNEP GRID-Arendal were prepared to continue, but that comments were needed from the countries at this stage. It was **decided** that the countries would provide comments within two months.

Mr. Katerås introduced an extensive discussion paper "*A Global Overview of the Conservation of Migratory Birds Outside the Arctic*" (1.1.vi) submitted by Russia in co-operation with the Netherlands and the Secretariat of the Bonn Convention on Migratory Species. **Russia** explained that the report provides information on the species of birds that breed in significant numbers in the Arctic but spend the winter outside the Arctic. It focuses on international conventions, legal instruments, regional programs, and other relevant plans that exist to conserve these birds. **The Netherlands** cautioned that the document does not necessarily reflect the position of the Dutch government. The meeting was further informed that the Dutch government intends to make a detailed flyway Atlas of all wader species as a follow up to the report and that the German government has offered to support a project to establish a world-wide data base of species of migratory birds. The Netherlands requested comments on the paper which it wishes to finalise and distribute to a wider audience. The **participants** commended this effort as an example of how an observer country can contribute to CAFF.

Ice Edge Pilot Mapping Project (1.3.i-iii)

The Arctic Network, a co-operator on the project, was unable to attend the meeting but delivered a short status report. It noted that significant background material for the project has been gathered during the last months and that substantial changes in the environment have been observed in the Beringia region, such as thinning of the pack-ice and delayed freeze-up in the fall. These are affecting hunting by local people in the area.

Mr Katerås concluded the report on Habitat Conservation by noting that CAFF had, for all practical purposes, completed its assigned work. However, many of the products were in the form of discussion papers and their fates would have to be discussed in connection with the 1997-98 Work Plan and the long-term action plan being developed

5.2 Flora Conservation(Work Items 1.2, 2.1, 2.2 2.4) - Facilitator: Steven Talbot, USA

Mr Talbot gave a short introduction to each of the work items and asked the lead countries comment if they wished.

Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Mapping Project - CAVM (1.2.i-ii)

Mr. Talbot provided Heads of Delegations with hard copies and a CD-ROM containing three map products from the CVAM project: a greenness map, an infrared map, and a "first of its kind" shaded relief map based on digital data. The work on prototype maps is in progress from the Yukon Delta and the North Slope in Alaska, the Canadian Archipelago, and Greenland. A workshop will be held in Arendal, Norway, in 1998 to review progress and reflect on the results. Regarding future funding, an application has been submitted to the National Science Foundation. *Mr. Talbot* advised that all the major species, ecosystem or biodiversity concerns of CAFF could be linked to the CAVM effort and stressed that it was extremely important for this work to continue as a basic framework for other CAFF initiatives.

Atlas of Rare Endemic Vascular Plants of the Arctic (2.1.i-iv)

Mr. Talbot reported that all work items under this heading had been completed with contributions from the countries in a real "team effort". He extended special thanks to the WCMC for extremely valuable help with the distribution maps produced as part of the project. *Mr. Talbot* noted that it had been important from the beginning that the *Atlas* be relevant and useful for CAFF's conservation efforts. In all ninety six taxa were identified as rare north of the treeline and listed in the *Atlas*. A simple gap analysis had shown that only 30% are fully protected within protected areas. The remaining 70% are either unprotected (47%) or partially protected (23%). Using the IUCN red list threat categories, 19 % of the taxa are vulnerable, 29 % are near threatened, 26 % are in the least concern lower risk category and 1 % are endangered. For 24 %, data were deficient. The *Atlas* will be printed as a CAFF publication and placed on the CAFF website in 1998.

List of Non Endemic Arctic Plants of Common Concern (2.1.v)

This list now contains about sixty species and is meant to complement the *Atlas of Rare Endangered Vascular Plants of the Arctic*. *Russia* noted that the taxa on this list would be specified through consultations with all the CAFF countries and annotated according to the scheme adopted for the rare endemic plants. When combined these lists could form the basis of a Red Data Book for the Arctic

Pan Arctic Flora Initiative (2.2.i)

Mr. Talbot stated that notwithstanding severe lack of funding, Russia had continued its work on a draft version of the Pan-Arctic Check List. Two hundred species have been added since Rovaniemi, and work on the text is continuing. A draft Check List is planned by the end of 1998 for presentation and review. After that, work on a short version of the Pan-Arctic Flora with keys for determination of species can begin. This work will form a common taxonomical ground for further conservation activities in the Arctic.

In concluding the presentation on Flora Conservation, *Mr. Talbot* noted that two countries had provided written input to his work as facilitator. *Norway* suggested a better linkage between the Pan Arctic Flora and CAFF and, secondly, that rare Arctic mosses and lichens be catalogued. *The United States* commented that with the work on the Atlas close to completion, the attention of the flora group should be shifted towards the CAVM and CPAN projects. This latter comment again raised the question of whether CAFF has an official "Flora Group". *Russia* reiterated its view that a flora group should exist being a very practical unit. *The United States* noted that Arctic vegetation is extremely sensitive to UV radiation and climate change and that the flora work, especially the CAVM, is an increasingly important part of the program. This work will provide baseline information to assess future effects of increased UV-B radiation and potential climatic change. The US called for a tighter linkage of the flora work with CPAN.

5.3 Fauna Conservation: (Work Items 2.3-2.4) - *Facilitator: Kent Wohl, Canada*

Mr Wohl began by asserting that fauna connects the Arctic through, for example, shared species and populations, common risks and conservation goals.

The International Murre Conservation Strategy and Action Plan (2.3.i)

This project is in the implementation phase. The countries are preparing five-year implementation plans to be combined and published by mid-year 1998. All the countries have submitted their murre colony data, and work is progressing with the WCMC to create a circumpolar database by the middle of 1998. The murre monitoring and banding plans are scheduled by the end of 1997. An integrated murre banding recovery report is under development, in which banding data from various projects combined and analysed for the first time.

The Circumpolar Eider Conservation Strategy and Action Plan (2.3.ii)

CAFF has been charged with implementing this strategy. *Mr. Wohl* suggested that CAFF follow the same course of action as with the *Murre Strategy* and proposed that five-year action plans be ready by the end of 1998.

Mr. Wohl reported on the status of the remaining CSWG (Circumpolar Seabird Working Group) work items (2.3.iii-vii). The reports on "seabird harvest", "incidental mortality of seabirds", and "human disturbance at seabird colonies" are planned to be published as CAFF technical reports by the end of 1997. The next edition of the Circumpolar Seabird Bulletin is due in early 1998. A meeting of CSWG was held in St Johns Newfoundland in the spring of 1997 and the next one has been scheduled in the fall of 1998 in Iceland. *Mr. Wohl* suggested that the CSWG prepare a report on seabird issues to identify new priorities for the focus of the group's work. On the status of a technical report on eider populations in CAFF countries, he informed the meeting that all the information had been collected and a draft was forthcoming.

Threatened Species and Species of Common Conservation Concern (2.4.i)

The final item under fauna conservation gave rise to considerable discussion about CAFF listing activities. *Mr Wohl* recalled that CAFF started work on various lists as early as 1992. *The Executive Secretary* explained that seven lists with different criteria and at different stage of development exist within CAFF. The NR/PP meeting in Akureyri had decided to combine these lists in one document in order to bring CAFF's current listing activities to a close for the time being. However, no funds were found for this task. The CAFF lists range from lists of vulnerable and endangered flora and fauna species to species of common conservation concern. Some *countries* expressed concerns over lists of this nature and cautioned not to split individual lists from the criteria used to design them. *Canada* suggested that CAFF lists were placed on the CAFF website and would then be regularly maintained and updated by the individual countries, but added that this idea needed further consideration.

5.4 Biodiversity Conservation (Work Item 3) - *Facilitator: Eeva Furman, Finland.*

Co-operative Strategy for Conservation of Biological Diversity in the Arctic Region (3.1.)

Eeva Furman reviewed CAFF's efforts on biodiversity and noted that the term "biodiversity" began appearing in CAFF documents in 1993 when the Ministers at their Nuuk Conference asked CAFF to advance the goals of the CBD in the Arctic. The effort

culminated in the *Co-operative Strategy for Conservation of Biological Diversity in the Arctic Region* presented in draft to Ministers in Inuvik in 1996 and in final form to the Ministers in 1997 at Alta where it was approved.

Biodiversity Monitoring (3.2)

On biodiversity monitoring, *Peter Nielsen*, Greenland, reported that a questionnaire had been prepared and would soon be distributed, first to specialists and then to the countries.

Threats to Arctic Biodiversity (3.3)

Eeva Furman stated that the issue of threats to Arctic biodiversity has received attention from CAFF since its earliest days, with several matrices of threats prepared. These were followed by the discussion paper *An Investigation into the Threats to Flora, Fauna and Habitat* developed by Finland for CAFF IV. At CAFF V, Finland undertook to prepare the final report on *Threats to Arctic Biodiversity* which is intended to be presented to the SAOs in early 1998. The Report is divided into three main sections: Introduction, description and analysis which attempts to look at the interrelationships of threats and their causes as well as their geographical extent. Ms. Furman asked for comments on the draft by December 1997.

5.5 Integration of Indigenous Peoples (Work Item 4) - Facilitator: Fred McFarland, Canada

All the work items under this heading have been completed and *Fred McFarland* took the opportunity to review what has been done within CAFF since the 1992 meeting in Ottawa when CAFF began considering how to address the AEPS objective "to seek to accommodate the traditional and cultural needs, values and practices of Indigenous Peoples." He reviewed the work items, workshops and seminars held and said that CAFF now has available numerous recommendations produced by these activities and that these recommendations need to be "operationalised". He added that the ICC had agreed at the NR/PP meeting in Akureyri to consider and bring back to CAFF specific proposals on how to use these recommendations to advance the goal of fully integrating Indigenous Peoples in CAFF's work.

Canada pointed out that it was CAFF's long standing goal to incorporate traditional knowledge as appropriate. *The IPS* commented that the whole issue of traditional knowledge and its application was extremely complicated and still under consideration

internally within the IPS. An important aspect is that the initiative comes from the local communities. The IPS offered to work with the CAFF Secretariat and others on a framework for how to integrate and apply indigenous knowledge. *Canada* agreed that at this point it was up to the Indigenous Peoples' Organisations to approach CAFF and indicate how they would like to continue this work

5. 6. Associated Projects (Work Items 2.5, 5.1, 5.3) - *Facilitator: David Henry, UNEP GRID -Arendal*

David Henry explained that "Associated Projects" were a new concept in CAFF and that they are projects formally acknowledged by CAFF as important in meeting CAFF's conservation goals but that are sponsored and financed by others.

Terrestrial Migratory Species Database (2.5)

Christoph Zöckler, WCMC, informed that work has been ongoing for a year and a half and so far GIS maps for about forty species have been completed. Mr. Zöckler pointed out that GIS mapping is a very powerful tool for integrating various information sources and, as an example, he referred to the data from the CAVM project which show coincidences between "hot spots" of selected bird taxa and rare plants. He stated that the Internet is a good medium to quickly update information, but a printed copy was also planned. He alerted the meeting to a website under the WCMC homepage, named Arctic Bird Library, containing a variety of information on forty species of birds covered so far.

CD-ROM (5.i.iii)

With respect to GRID-Arendal's offer to produce a CD-ROM of the currently accessible circumpolar CAFF maps and related GIS information, *Mr. Henry* explained that GRID-Arendal now considers this a redundant product, since most of the data-sets will be available from GRID-Arendal's on-line databases. In addition, there are plans to publish a more integrated CD-ROM with data from AMAP, PAME, and CAFF.

Conservation Atlas of the Arctic (5.3.i)

Mr. Henry explained that efforts to find a publisher had been unsuccessful. A meeting of WWF, GRID-Arendal and the Norwegian Directorate for Nature Management had

suggested that WWF instead explored the feasibility of publishing a WWF Arctic Book directed at a wide audience. CAFF should consider producing an Atlas with a focus on CPAN, aimed at the CAFF audience and decision makers. WWF offered to look for funding for this latter product but will otherwise take only a passive role. The meeting had further suggested that the CAFF Secretariat be more proactive in distributing information to a larger audience. *The Netherlands* regretted the decision to withdraw the Atlas project as there is a need for a comprehensive overview of CAFF's conservation efforts. A warning note was struck against relying too much on the Internet since people in many places are completely dependent on written material for their information. *The WWF* explained that the publishers did not think an Atlas could "sell" and noted further that CAFF perhaps needs a communications strategy within which these issues could be dealt with.

Mr. Henry concluded by presenting a project proposal, developed jointly by WCMC, GRID-Arendal and the CAFF Secretariat to integrate information emanating from CAFF, and other related activities and feed this information into the CPAN process in order to identify gaps in the network and assist the countries with conservation planning.

Agenda Item 6: Report from the Workshop on Circumpolar Arctic Nature Conservation, Karrebæksminde, Denmark, September 23-25, 1997.

Leslie Kerr stated that a basic premise of the Karrebæksminde workshop had been to generate ideas to help CAFF evolve. The Workshop's objectives were to:

- Identify threats to Arctic biodiversity.
- Identify partners and leaders to work with conservation and sustainable use.
- Review CAFF's strengths and weaknesses.
- Suggest changes and define a more focused framework for future CAFF activities.

Workshop findings: CAFF's main strength is that it is a working group of qualified and enthusiastic people. A major weakness is lack of funding or funding imbalance. A "Communications Strategy" and a "CAFF State of the Arctic Environment Report" analogous to AMAPs SOAER were considered two things that would improve CAFF. The workshop considered the future priority objectives for CAFF that were identified by the NRs and PPs and it concluded that the objective on species and habitat conservation might more appropriately be considered as an overall goal for CAFF. The workshop assigned the following priorities to the remaining objectives and added a new fifth objective:

1. Establish and maintain a Circumpolar Protected Areas Network (CPAN).
1. Develop and implement strategies other than protected areas to maintain overall ecosystem integrity in the Arctic.
2. Integrate biodiversity and socio-economic considerations into development strategies.
3. Enhance efforts to monitor changes in Arctic biodiversity and identify and evaluate factors influencing these changes.
4. Communicate CAFF issues/concerns to decision makers and the general public, in order to achieve objectives one to four.

Canada pointed out that since about seventeen people representing most of the participating countries and organisations in CAFF had attended the Karrebæksminde workshop, it was important to look at these two events as overlapping activities. *The IPS* commented on the need of distributing information about CAFF to the public, especially through electronic media which are gaining ground in the Arctic. During the ensuing discussion, *Norway* also commented on the frequent comparison made between CAFF and AMAP and noted that their mandates were totally different. AMAP's sole mandate had been to produce the State of the Arctic Environment Report on pollutants. *The Chair* concluded the session by thanking the workshop sponsors (WWF, the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries of the Netherlands and UNEP).

Agenda Item 7: Development of the Long-term Action Plan

7.1 Report from *Ad Hoc* Group on Sustainable Use of Arctic Renewable Resources

Frederik Theisen reported that, in the absence of terms of reference for the Arctic Council's sustainable development initiative, the *Ad Hoc* Group had not reached consensus on how to respond to the request in the SAAO Report to Ministers 1997 to "outline ideas and proposals regarding the conservation and sustainable use of Arctic renewable resources". Hence, the group focused on identifying general mechanisms by which CAFF can contribute to the sustainable development initiative (Appendix II). The group determined that CAFF activities fall into four basic categories: (1) data compilation (e.g. vegetation mapping, beluga project); (2) data analysis (e.g. threats work, gap analysis); (3) strategy development (e.g. Biodiversity, Murre, Eider) and (4) action plans (e.g. CPAN, Murre) implemented nationally. The group noted that CAFF can contribute to the sustainable development program of the Arctic Council in basically three ways: (1) by evaluating the sustainability of a proposed project; (2) by facilitating compilation of additional data needed; (3) by developing procedures to monitor the long-term sustainability of projects and to review the results.

Discussion focused on two issues. The first was the perceived impasse caused by the US decision not to address the issue in any substantive way until terms of reference were set for the Arctic Council's sustainable development program. The second was the different interpretations of the notions of "conservation", "sustainable use" and "sustainable development". **Most countries** held the view that conservation and sustainable use are basically analogous but different from sustainable development. It was noted that CAFF has been engaged in many projects involving sustainable use such as e.g. the *Murre* and *Eider* strategies. The **WWF** was disappointed that the *Ad Hoc* Group could not come up with a more proactive proposal, especially in light of the fact that the Arctic is seen by many as a test case for sustainable development. The **Chair** noted that CAFF had been assigned this task by the SAOs collectively in Alta and that it needed to be addressed somehow. He suggested that the National Representatives individually brief their SAOs and that he, as Chair, would write a letter to Ambassador Mary Simon outlining the situation. **Canada** suggested that the issue might also be addressed by tabling the requested long-term action plan with the SAOs. The plan would clearly reflect CAFF's ideas and priorities regarding sustainable use of Arctic renewable resources.

7.2 Report of the Analytical Group (AG)

Ævar Petersen reported on the work of the Analytical Group (AG) established at Rovaniemi. Members included Canada, Finland, Greenland, Iceland and the US. Its main task was to find ways to focus the work of the program and to develop proposals for CAFF's future role and activities within the Arctic Council. The AG convened twice, in November (Oslo) and in February (Akureyri). The AG identified conservation of biological diversity and providing scientific input to the sustainable development initiative of the Arctic Council as the two basic future functions of CAFF. It co-ordinated the final review of the *Cooperative Strategy* as an overall conservation framework for CAFF and decided to develop action oriented recommendations for a five-year action plan as a separate exercise. The five-year plan would serve as the foundation for future CAFF Annual Work Plans. The AG, along with the remaining countries and Permanent Participants, ranked the 14 objectives of the *Cooperative Strategy* and selected five as priorities for the next few years. They excluded the objective related to involvement of local and indigenous people from the exercise because it was felt to be inherent in all the others. The work of the AG was approved by the SAO's in Kautokeino and by the Ministers in Alta. Iceland accepted to develop a draft long-term action plan based on the five priority objectives endorsed by the SAAOs. However, at Alta the task was refined and Iceland was asked to develop a document which could serve as a framework for individual country inputs to this process. Mr. Petersen concluded his presentation by stating that the task to develop the first draft action plan would be this meeting's. He thanked members of the AG for their productive work.

7.3 Report from *Ad Hoc* Group on the Long-term Action Plan

Finn Katerås reported that the basis for the group discussions was Iceland's framework document, the results from the Karrebæksminde Workshop (see previous item), and input from countries. The group suggested re-naming the document *Strategic Plan* rather than action plan. An outline for the *Strategic Plan* containing revised and rearranged objectives was provided to the meeting along with a matrix for assisting in the identification of action areas (Appendix III).

There was some concern about the re-worded objectives and a *consensus* was reached that the *Strategic Plan* outline would be used for working purposes in discussion groups formed around each of the five objectives. The *Chair* suggested that members of the Analytical Group, and the Karrebæksminde Workshop be represented in each of discussion groups to ensure that various ideas and views were represented. The five discussion groups were tasked with fine tuning the objectives and coming up with 5-6 action areas for each of them.

7.4 Reports from Discussion Groups on Priority Objectives (Appendix IV)

Discussion Group 1: Monitoring - Richard Elliot rapporteur

The group suggested that CAFF's major initiative in monitoring should be the eventual implementation of a Co-ordinated Arctic Biodiversity Monitoring System. This task should be accomplished in a sequential fashion through several sub-projects: (1) outlining the framework for such a system with respect to changes in species, habitats, and indicators of ecosystem health, and factors that are causing the change; (2) conducting an overview of existing and proposed monitoring programs for Arctic species and habitats with reference to different types of monitoring and spatial scales and, (3) identifying gaps and sources of information on past change such as from traditional knowledge.

Discussion Group 2: Species Conservation - John Bengtson rapporteur

The group identified six general action areas. The first three are of a data gathering type (1) to identify species and populations of Arctic biodiversity and evaluate information needs, (2) to determine the status and trends of populations, and (3) to identify threats facing them. The remaining three action areas are more strategically oriented: (4) to

evaluate the potential conservation needs of transboundary species and populations that are not already addressed by international or regional agreements, (5) to develop and implement conservation strategies for species and populations of common conservation concern, and (6) to link with groups and activities outside of CAFF to promote the conservation of Arctic migratory populations. The group acknowledged that its recommendations were general but considered it outside its purview to recommend specific tasks such as selecting which species to prioritise for action. That task could be handled by special CAFF sub-groups or existing groups within or outside CAFF.

Discussion Group 3: Protected Areas - Leslie Kerr rapporteur.

The group created a broad list of seventeen issues which were then ranked on the basis of importance. The top six were: (1) Evaluate the contribution of the existing protected area system to conservation of ecosystem, habitats, and species, e.g. through a gap analysis, development of an ecosystem classification scheme and circumpolar criteria for identifying biological hot spots; (2) Develop initiatives and linkages outside the Arctic for migratory species, through e.g. identifying key habitats for migration and wintering and promoting their conservation; (3) Enhance efforts for marine conservation; (4) Involve local and indigenous people and traditional ecological knowledge in establishing and managing protected areas; (5) Identify the effects of various outside stressors on protected areas, e.g. through conducting sensitivity analysis of stocks, species and habitats; (6) Identify and communicate the values that are being protected, e.g. through a communications strategy or by developing a "CAFF Assessment Report" targeted at a general audience and using information from CAFF.

Discussion Group 4: Conservation Outside Protected Areas - Henry Huntington rapporteur

The group advocated a coherent approach to Arctic conservation and identified co-operation and interconnectedness of the various action areas as important for the *Strategic Plan* as a whole. The view was that an Arctic Habitat Conservation Strategy encompassed nearly all the ideas under this objective and that this long-standing task should be reflected in the objective. Three areas for action were underscored: (1) Assessments of threats and impacts, such as those of land and resource use, habitat loss and fragmentation and of alien species introductions; (2), Identification of key sensitive habitats (e.g. calving grounds, spawning areas); (3) Review of planning principles and mechanisms, such as for land-use planning, for conservation outside protected areas and for marine habitat conservation.

Discussion Group 5: Sectoral Integration - Socio-economic Considerations - Finn Katerås rapporteur

This objective was by far the most controversial and confusing primarily because of the differing opinions on what was expected of the group and how it related to sectoral integration. The group met twice and during its first session, suggested making the objective more proactive by clarifying that CAFF is to provide scientific and technical advice as a means to integrate conservation concerns into the various sectors (through e.g. guidelines and communications strategies). Links to other objectives were emphasised and issues highlighted as important were the livelihood of Arctic people, threats to Arctic flora and fauna and communication to decision makers. The group identified two priority action areas: "themes" and "tools". Priority themes identified were tourism, transportation, timberline forests, grazing, and hunting and fishing (excluding take of or trade in marine mammals), while under "tools", communication tools to reach various decision makers and the general public were listed as a priority.

The group met a second time and refined its proposal to respond to the general uneasiness expressed in *plenary* that the issues identified as "themes" looked like a list of threats but were not the most important from a CAFF perspective. Consequently, the focus was on the tools, i.e. communications, rather than issues or themes. The group stressed good co-operation with sectors which calls for reliable information and good communications. Five priorities for action were proposed. (1) to review and evaluate existing principles and mechanisms for communicating information on values of biodiversity, (2) to identify priority target sectors for initial investigation, (3) to examine sectoral integration as it affects indigenous communities, (4) to hold best practices workshops in co-operation with various sectors; and (5) to develop specific strategies and approaches for these sectors. Comments were generally positive but it was agreed that time was needed to assess the proposal.

5. Plenary Discussion on the Reports of the Discussion Groups

Discussion focused on objective five. Issues highlighted included:

- The need to focus more on raising profile and public awareness of conservation issues in the Arctic.
- The need for CAFF to be more visible to decision makers, i.e. in getting its message across to those who manage Arctic biological diversity.
- The need to realise that socio-economic decision makers are found in all levels in society, not only in government - i.e. hunters and tourists make decisions that affect biodiversity.
- The need for CAFF to be proactive, not just a passive provider of information.

- The need to emphasise the socio-economic value of Arctic biodiversity, i.e. the value of resources at risk.

Several suggestions were made to improve the *Strategic Plan* itself such as making it consistent in terms of level of detail, broadening the section for cross-cutting issues and ensuring that the five-year perspective is evident throughout. *Delegates* noted that time is needed to fully consider and evaluate the document.

The *Chair* noted that the five original priority objectives and their wording had been endorsed at the Ministerial meeting in Alta and a change of wording would be problematic. He explained that the plan would not be finished at this meeting but through a review process and emphasised that the meeting exercise had been intended to focus the work of CAFF, not add to it. In terms of further development of the *Strategic Plan*, *Iceland* considered the work of the Analytical Group finished, but agreed to develop, in co-operation with the Secretariat and others, a first discussion outline of the *Plan*. This discussion outline would be subjected to a thorough review before a draft is submitted to the SAOs for their February 1998 meeting.

7.6 Proposals Pertaining to Future Activities.

Communications Strategy.

Iceland proposed to initiate work on communications by preparing an outline of a CAFF Communications Strategy with assistance from UNEP GRID-Arendal.

Sustainable Use of Northern Timberline Forests

Finland presented the project on Northern Timberline Forests which was initiated under the AEPS Sustainable Development and Utilisation Program (SDU) but has been dormant since the disbanding of that group at the Inuvik meeting in 1996. Finland proposed using CAFF as a framework for the project. The timberline forest is defined as the circumpolar transition zone between the northern taiga and the tundra. Although this ecosystem is still relatively intact, that situation may be rapidly changing. Hence the main objective of the project is to develop guidelines for sustainable use and development of these forests in the future. A workshop will be held in Whitehorse, Canada on May 10-11, 1998, in advance of the Conference on Sustainable Development in the Arctic, to be held on May 12-14. The proceedings from that workshop will provide a background for further discussions on the issue.

Sacred Land and Protected Areas

RAIPON proposed including sacred lands and graveyards of Indigenous Peoples of the Arctic in the establishment of protected areas and CPAN. It was noted that sacred lands and graveyards are also special areas for wildlife protection. The **IPS** further explained that graveyards and sacred lands are in essence wildlife sanctuaries to Indigenous Peoples, since hunting is not allowed. The **United States** explained that while protected areas are established primarily for wildlife, special areas for indigenous people could be considered as added benefits along with other criteria for establishing protected areas and consistent with statements made in the SAAO Report to Ministers (Alta). The **WWF** referred to the newly established Kytalyk Reserve in the Sakha Republic of Russia as a good example of a protected area built around sacred sites.

Circumpolar Case Study on Tourism in Relation to Protected Areas

See Other Business, below.

Agenda Item 8: Management Issues

1. United States' White Paper on Procedures

John Bengtson explained that this paper had been prepared almost a year ago following the Rovaniemi meeting to assist the Analytical Group and that, in retrospect, some of the ideas and approaches outlined in the paper might be redundant or already incorporated in CAFF. Mr. Bengtson went on to review the main points of the paper which include:

- Annual CAFF Meetings should focus on technical conservation issues in an open plenary, taking full advantage of the expertise of the countries, permanent participants and observers.
- National Representatives meetings should focus on administrative aspects, Secretariat issues, procedural matters, etc.
- Rather than having formal minutes distributed afterwards, a draft report should be developed at the annual meetings, covering work plan progress, issues discussed at the meeting and messages to SAOs and Ministers.
- CAFF should establish two types of groups - Co-ordinating groups (Flora and Fauna) and Specialist groups.

8.2 Review and Approval of Project Proposals

Kevin McCormick presented a discussion paper and advised that this was a joint effort with the Secretariat and was built on the work of the US and others. The intent was to propose a process for reviewing and approving project proposals. Key considerations in assessing proposals relate to, for example, the need to:

- Reflect the opinion and policies of the national governments in order to appeal to national funding sources.
- Frame priorities in thematic rather than project-specific terms and present them in a manner that decision makers can relate to.
- Focus on multilateral and circumpolar issues and ones that are not being addressed elsewhere.
- Solicit active participation by Permanent Participants in developing and reviewing projects and in suggesting priorities.
- Take full advantage of the resources and the expertise of NGOs wherever possible.

Based on these considerations a review process was proposed that called for deadlines to be well ahead of Annual Meetings and for:

- All proposals to be officially led and sponsored by at least one country or Permanent Participant.
- Project acceptance be a two step process (**in principle endorsement** and **approval**) which may or may not be completed at the same meeting since final approval would not be granted unless there was a clear evidence that the required resources were committed to deliver the project.
- Project proposals to follow a fixed format to ensure consistency.

3. Plenary Discussion on Management issues.

With regard to the US White Paper, it was noted that the thematic mandates of the coordinating groups suggested by the US ("flora" and "fauna") needed re-examination in light of the new objectives.

With regard to the Canadian paper, concerns were that:

- A forced sponsorship of all projects by a country would jeopardise the concept of "associated projects" which was felt to be an important catalytic function of CAFF. *The IUCN* noted, for example, that CAFF's recognition of the importance of a project might provide the impetus needed for organisations like IUCN to participate actively.

- A two step approach to accepting projects might lead to redundancy of work - i.e. there might be a temptation to go for an in principle acceptance without having any assurance for funding.

The **Chair** emphasised that the SAOs had asked for recommendations regarding organisational and procedural aspects of the program. It was noted that the issue could be addressed at two levels: (1) short-term in light of the specific SAO request; (2) ongoing in light of the need to find more effective ways of conducting internal business. It was **agreed** that the next logical step would be to merge the US and Canadian proposals into one set of recommendations or operating guidelines and the US offer to lead a small *ad hoc* group on program management to initiate this work at the meeting was accepted.

8.4 Report from Ad Hoc Group on Program Management- John Bengtson rapporteur

John Bengtson presented a two page amalgamation of the US and Canadian papers "Proposals to improve the efficiency of CAFF's work "(Appendix V). It was suggested that an executive summary with fixed information be mandatory for project proposals but that authors should have some leeway for structuring the proposals. Preview by the Secretariat was considered unnecessary, and a two-step approval process was questioned on the basis that project sponsors should have some assurance of funding before they came up with proposals. Associated projects were judged important and approval of those should follow similar procedures. With regard to the US proposals, Mr. Bengtson's highlighted the issue of working groups and suggested that *ad hoc* groups would be formed around each of the five objectives listed in the *Strategic Plan*. These groups could communicate over the Internet and report at the next CAFF meeting.

The recommendations were received favourably, although some countries noted a difficulty in finding enough people to participate in the five groups suggested. The **Chair** asked the chairmen of the five *ad hoc* groups formed previously (see Section 7.3) to initiate e-mail discussions among those interested, with the aim to assist CAFF in advancing work on the five priority objectives and help preparing recommendations to the Ministers. It was further **decided** to submit the draft proposals on management issues to the October, 1997 meeting of the SAOs, and that Canada and the US would continue to develop these proposals into more formal Management Guidelines for CAFF.

8.5 Report of the Chair

Peter Nielsen touched on three issues but referred otherwise to his previous report under Agenda Item four:

- He reiterated that CAFF has delivered several major reports and that its work in general has been valued and accepted and its products welcomed by the Ministers.
- He commended the Analytical Group and CAFF for having made significant progress in refocusing the program and noted that the remaining confusion is understandable - CAFF is a well-functioning program that has now to make its way in a new organisation, the Arctic Council, with its function uncertain.
- Unresolved issues are no secure financial basis for CAFF's work or for its Secretariat although Iceland's additional contribution is much appreciated.

8.6 Report of the Secretariat

Snorri Baldursson cited his tabled report which highlighted Secretariat activities since Rovaniemi. Some specifics were e.g.:

- In terms of implementing the Secretariat requirements in the 1996-97 Work Plan, the Secretariat co-ordinated the preparation of a *CPAN Progress Report 1997* (item 1.1.i); a "*Draft CPAN Reporting and Evaluation Guide*" (item 1.1.ii); and delivered reports to SAAO meetings in Oslo and Kautokeino and the Ministerial Meeting in Alta (item 5.2.i); the CAFF Website was regularly updated and used as a major source of information (item 5.2.ii).
- With respect to management and information activity, all CAFF's archives were electronically recorded, including the "gray literature", one issue of CAFF's Newsletter was published, and a new logo and layout was designed.
- Present staff in addition to the Executive Secretary are Snæbjorn Friðriksson - Program Officer (part time) and Vigdís Rafnsdóttir - Administrative Assistant (part time).
- The Secretariat operated strictly within the budget set in Inuvik of USD 147,000 cash and USD 15.000 *in kind* contributions.

Concerns identified by Mr. Baldursson included financial contributions arriving late from some countries, a limited human resource base of the Secretariat to adequately address the workload - especially regarding communication and liaison issues, and slow and frequently inadequate response by countries to Secretariat requests.

Agenda Item 9: Planning Ahead

9.1 Preparation of the 1997-98 CAFF Work Plan

The Executive Secretary presented a draft Interim Work Plan prepared the night before with assistance from Henry Huntington (USA). It was organised around the five priority

objectives, as worded in the *Cooperative Strategy* and as endorsed by the Ministers. Proposals for new projects were included.

Plenary Discussion on Scope and Time Frame of the Work Plan

The *Chair* suggested, in light of a decision to postpone the CAFF Annual Meeting, to prepare a regular Work Plan that would take CAFF to the next Ministerial Meeting in September 1998. *Norway* suggested preparing a Work Plan for 20 months to take CAFF to the next Annual Meeting scheduled for the spring of 1999. The *Executive Secretary* explained that the draft Work Plan had not been prepared with a 20-month time-frame in mind and that such a long-term Work Plan would be problematic based on two main concerns:

- The countries did not come to the meeting prepared to propose activities for the next 20 months.
- Assuming endorsement by the Ministers of the *Strategic Plan* in September, there would be an eight month delay until CAFF could start working according to that Plan.

A rather lengthy and lively discussion followed on the scope and time frame of the upcoming CAFF Work Plan with suggestions ranging from "CAFF should not adopt a Work Plan extending beyond the Ministerial meeting" to "hold an extended NR/PP meeting that could develop a new interim work plan after the Ministerial meeting". *The Chair* decided to resolve the issue at a Heads of Delegations meeting.

Report of Heads of Delegations meeting - Kevin McCormick

Mr. McCormick reported on key decisions regarding the 1997-98 CAFF Work Plan:

- It shall be valid until September 1998.
- It shall consider new project proposals only if they (a) relate to the five objectives listed in the draft work plan and (b) can be completed before September 1998.
- Given that the SAO's are very concerned about CAFF's workload, all new projects will be highlighted in the draft Work Plan for their benefit.

2. Work Plan Development

Following the discussion, the work plan development proceeded uneventfully. The *Chair* noted that the draft Work Plan 1997-98 would be subject to a final review within the countries before it could be endorsed. *Norway* offered to provide up to \$35,000 USD for a limited CPAN gap-analysis, focusing on the Russian Arctic, provided that other resources become available.

9.3 Future Annual Meetings

CAFF VII - Canada, spring of 1999.

CAFF VIII - Norway, fall of 2000.

CAFF IX - Sweden will consider hosting in 2001.

Agenda Item 10: Recommendations to SAOs and Ministers.

It was *agreed* that the Secretariat and the incoming Chair, Kevin McCormick, develop a draft report to the upcoming SAO meeting in Ottawa incorporating the main considerations from CAFF VI.

Agenda Item 11: Other Business

John Waugh, IUCN alerted the meeting to a Workshop on Biodiversity Hot-spots in Russia to be held in November. The workshop is sponsored by IUCN together with Friends of the Earth, Japan, and local authorities in the Russian Far East. *Mr. Waugh* then presented the "Proposal for a Circumpolar Case Study on Tourism in Relation to Protected Areas" as an associated project of CAFF. He explained that the initial proposal referenced in his opening remarks had been modified in light of the need to present a product by the September 1998 deadline and was now structured into two phases. Phase I (site selection; study methodology; design) will be completed in advance of the September deadline. The Study will use CPAN sites and will cover, *inter alia*, impacts of tourism on biodiversity, tourism data collection and assessment and involvement of local communities. As a corollary project, the IUCN is also preparing an issues-based discussion paper on Tourism in the Circumpolar Arctic and an annotated outline was provided to national delegations.

There was a broad support for the IUCN proposal provided it could be phased into the September 1998 deadline. *Finland* suggested collaboration with a project of the Barents Task Force on "Nature Conservation, Cultural Heritage and Ecological Tourism in the Barents Region".

RAIPON notified the meeting of the Congress of the Leaders of the Arctic in Salekhard in the beginning of April 1998. He invited the CAFF Chair and Secretariat to attend and report on the work of CAFF. He felt it would be a good opportunity to raise the profile of CAFF with the local Arctic communities and authorities.

Agenda Item 12: Close of Meeting

The Chair thanked participants for coming to Nuuk with the hope that they had enjoyed their stay and received some impression of Greenland's nature and way of life. He thanked the National Representatives, Permanent Participants, the Secretariat and the CAFF Working Group for good team-work and co-operation during his tenure as Chair and then passed the torch on to Kevin McCormick, Canada. *Mr. McCormick* in turn thanked the outgoing Chair, noting that Mr. Nielsen had, on a very short notice, stepped into what turned out to be a very demanding eighteen month period involving two Ministerial meetings.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Appendix I: CAFF VI Participants' list

Canadian delegation

Kevin McCormick, CAFF Chairman (new)

Environment Canada
P.O Box 2970
Yellowknife, NWT
Canada X1A 2P4
Tel: + 1 403 669 4760
Fax: + 1 403 873 8185
E-mail: kevin.mccormick@ec.gc.ca

Fred McFarland

10 Wellington St.
Room 648
Ottawa, Ontario
Canada K1A 0H4
Tel: + 1 819 997 9621
Fax: + 1 819 997 9623
E-mail: mcfarlandf@inac.gc.ca

Richard D. Elliot

Canadian Wildlife Service
Environment Canada
Box 1590
Sackville, NB
Canada E0A 3C0
Tel: + 1 506 364 5044
Fax: + 1 506 364 5062
E-mail: richard.elliott@ec.gc.ca

Sebastian Oosenbrug

RWED
GNWT 600
5102 - 50th Ave.
Yellowknife, NWT
Canada X1A 3S8
Tel: + 1 403 873 7760
Fax: + 1 403 873 0293
E-mail: bas_oosenbrug@gov.nt.ca

Danish/Greenlandic delegation

Peter Nielsen, CAFF Chairman (departing)

Greenland Homerule
Department of Environment and Nature
P.O. Box 1614
DK-3900 Nuuk, Greenland
Tel: + 299 23000
Fax: + 299 25286
E-mail: PEN@miljoe.hotel.gh.gl

Henrik Elling

Danish Polar Center
Strandgade 100 H
DK-1401 Copenhagen, Denmark
Tel: + 45 32 88 01 19
Fax: + 45 32 88 01 01
E-mail: he@dpc.dk

Lisbeth Bjørndal Andersen

Skov- og Naturstyrelsen
Haraldsgade 53
DK-2100 Copenhagen Ø, Denmark
Tel: + 45 39 47 20 00
Fax: + 45 39 27 98 99
E-mail: lba@sns.dk

Finnish delegation

Paula Kankaanmäki

Eeva Furman

Ministry of the Environment
P.O. Box 399
FIN-00121 Helsinki, Finland
Tel: + 358 9 1991 9739
Fax: + 358 9 1991 9717
E-mail: paula.kankaanpaa@vyh.fi

Finish Environment Institute
P.O. Box 140
FIN-00251 Helsinki, Finland
Tel: +358 9 40 300 713
Fax: + 358 9 40 300 798
E-mail: eeva.furman@vyh.fi

Icelandic delegation

Ævar Petersen

Icelandic Institute of Natural History
P.O Box 5320
IS-125 Reykjavik
Iceland
Tel: + 354 562 9822
Fax: + 354 562 0815
E-mail: aevar@nattfs.is

Norwegian delegation

Berit Lein Vice-chairman

Directorate for Nature Management
Tungslletta 2
N-7005 Trondheim, Norway
Tel: + 47 73 58 05 00
Fax: + 47 73 91 54 33
E-mail: berit.lein@dnpost.md.dep.telemax.no

Finn Kateraas

Directorate for Nature Management
Tungslletta 2
N-7005 Trondheim, Norway
Tel: + 47 73 58 05 00
Fax: + 47 73 91 54 33
E-mail: finn.kateras@dnpost.md.dep.telemax.no

Jan-Petter Huberth Hansen

Directorate for Nature Management
Tungslletta 2
N-7005 Trondheim, Norway
Tel: + 47 73 58 05 00
Fax: + 47 73 91 54 33
E-mail: jan-p.huberth-hansen@dnpost.md.dep.telemax.no

Frederik J. Theisen

Norwegian Polar Institute
P.O. Box 5072
Majorstua
N-0301 Oslo, Norway
Tel: + 47 22 95 95 00
Fax: + 47 22 95 95 01
E-mail: theisen@npolar.no

Hallvard Ström

Norwegian Ornithological Society
Seminarplassen 5
N-7060 Klæbu, Norway
Tel: + 47 73 59 61 15
Fax: + 47 72 83 12 55
E-mail: hallvars@james.stud.ntnu.no

Russian delegation**Vladimir A. Pischelev**

Department of Nature Reserves,
Ministry of the Environment 8 - 1 Kedrova Street
Moscow 117874, Russia
Tel: + 7 095 125 61 33
Fax: + 7 095 254 82 83
E-mail: wwfrus@glas.apc.org

Valery A. Orlov

The State Committee of the Russian
Federation for Environmental Protection
Department of Biological Resource Protection
4/6 Bolshaya Grouzinskaya Str.
Moscow 123812 GSP, Russia
Tel: + 7 095 127 84 10
Fax: + 7 095 254 82 83

Boris A Yurtsev

Komarov Botanical Institute
Russian Academy of Science
2 Prof. Popov Str.
St. Petersburg 197376, Russia
Tel: + 7 812 543 8367
Fax: + 7 812 234 4512
E-mail: alkov@sgfungi.bin.ras.spb.ru

Viktor Nikiforov

WWF Russia
c/o WWF 232
P.O. Box 289
Weybridge Surrey
KT13 8WJ, UK
Tel: + 7 095 1564 202
Fax: + 7 095 7420 680
E-mail: nikiforov@wwfrus.glasnet.ru

Swedish delegation**Christer Borgh**

Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Blekholtsterrassen 36
S-106 48 Stockholm
Sweden
Tel: + 46 8 698 13 73
Fax: + 46 8 698 1402
E-mail: cbo@environ.se

United States delegation

Janet E. Hohn

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1011 E. Tudor Road
Anchorage,
AK 99503, USA
Tel: + 1 907 786 3544
Fax: + 1 907 786 3640
E-mail: janet_hohn@mail.fws.gov.

Stephen S. Talbot

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1011 E. Tudor Road
Anchorage
AK 99503, USA
Tel: + 1 907 786 3381
Fax: + 1 907 786 3976
E-mail: 75327.1053@compuserve.com

Kenton D. Wohl

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1011 E. Tudor Road
Anchorage
AK 99503, USA
Tel: + 1 907 786 3503
Fax: + 1 907 786 3641
E-mail: kent_wohl@mail.fws.gov.

Robin Tuttle

National Marine Fisheries Service
Office of Science and Technology
1315 East-West Highway
Silverspring,
MD 20910, USA
Tel: + 1 508 281 9237
Fax: + 1 508 281 9371
robin.tuttle@noaa.gov

Charles Johnson

P.O.Box 946
Nome
AK 99762, USA
Tel: + 1 907 443 5044
Fax: + 1 907 443 5060

Leslie Kerr

Selawik NWR
P.O. Box 270
Kotzebue
AK 99752, USA
Tel: + 1 907 442 3799
Fax: + 1 907 442 3124
E-mail: leslie_kerr@mail.fws.gov

Tracy Hall

U.S. Department of State
OS/OA/PA
Room 5805
Washington DC 20520, USA
Tel: + 1 202 647 4972
Fax: + 1 202 647 4353
E-mail: tahall@state.gov

Henry P. Huntington Huntington Consulting

P.O. Box 773564
Eagle River
AK 99577, USA
Tel: + 1 907 696 3564
Fax: + 907 696 3565
E-mail: hph@alaska.net

John Bengtson

National Marine Mammal Laboratory
National Marine Fisheries Service / NOAA
7600 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle
WA 98115, USA
Tel: + 1 206 526 4016

Ellen Fritts

Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game
Habitat and Restoration Division
P.O. Box 25526
Juneau
AK 99802 - 5526, USA
Tel: + 1 907 465 4105

Fax: + 1 206 526 6615
E-mail: john.bengtson@noaa.gov

Fax: + 1 907 465 4759
E-mail: ellenf@fishgame.state.ak.us

Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat (IPS)

Tove Sövdahl-Petersen
Executive Secretary
AEPS Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat
Pilestraede 52
P.O. Box 2151
DK - 1016 Copenhagen, Denmark
Tel: + 45 33 69 34 98
Fax: + 45 33 69 34 99

Marianne Johansen
AEPS Indigenous Peoples' Secretariat
Pilestraede 52
P.O. Box 2151
DK - 1016 Copenhagen, Denmark
Tel: + 45 33 6934 98

Fax: + 45 33 69 34 99

Inuit Circumpolar Conference (ICC)

Alfred Jacobsen
Inuit Circumpolar Conference
P.O. Box 204
DK 3900 Nuuk, Greenland
Tel: + 299 2 36 32
Fax: + 299 2 30 01
E-mail: iccgreen@greenet.gl

Association of Indigenous Peoples of the North (AIPON)

Sergei Haruchi
#612 AIPON
8/2 Stroitelei Str.
Moscow
Russia
Tel: + 7 095 930 70 78
Fax: + 7 095 930 70 78

Observers

The Netherlands / The Bonn Convention / Wetlands International

Gerard C. Boere
Min. of LNV
Department of Nature
Management/International Affairs
P.O. Box 20401
2500 EK The Hague, The Netherlands
Tel: + 31 70 379 3591
Fax: + 31 70 379 3751
E-mail: g.c.boere@n.agro.nl

United Kingdom

Oliver William Heal
1 Whim Square
Lamancha West Linton
Tweeddale
EH 4678D, UK
Tel: + 44 1968 67 49 27
Fax: + 44 1968 67 49 27
E-mail: o.w.heal@ed.ac.uk

UNEP/GRID - Arendal

David Henry
P.O. Box 1602, Myrene
N-4801 Arendal
Norway
Tel: + 47 37 03 56 50
Fax: + 47 37 03 50 50
E-mail henry@grida.no

World Conservation Monitoring Centre

Christoph Zöckler
219 Huntington Road
Cambridge
CB3 0DL
UK
Tel: + 44 1223 277 314
Fax: + 44 1223 277 136
E-mail: christoph.zoeckler@wcmc.org.uk

IUCN

John Waugh
IUCN
1400 16th St. NW
Washington DC 20036, USA
Tel: + 1 202 797 5454
Fax: + 1 202 797 5461
E-mail: jwaugh@iucnus.org

Jeanne Pagnan
53 Brouage
Aylmer, Quebec
J9J 1J5, Canada
Tel: + 1 819 777 1767
Fax: + 1 819 777 1767
E-mail: jpagnan@compuserve.com

WWF International

Peter Prokosch

WWF International - Arctic Programme
St. Olavs Pl.
P.O. Box 6784
N-0130 Oslo
Norway
Tel: + 47 222 03774/5
Fax: + 47 222 00666
E-mail: peterp@sn.no

Peter Ewins

WWF - Canada
90 Eglinton Avenue East
Suite 504
Toronto, Ontario
M4P 2Z7
Canada
Tel: + 1 416 489 4567 Ext. 286
Fax: + 1 416 489 3611
E-mail: ewins@wwfcanada.org

CAFF International Secretariat

Snorri Baldursson

Executive Secretary
CAFF International Secretariat
Hafnarstraeti 97
P.O. Box 375
602 Akureyri, Iceland
Tel: + 354 462 33 50
Fax: + 354 462 33 90
E-mail: snorri@nattfs.is

Snaebjorn Fridriksson

CAFF International Secretariat
Hafnarstraeti 97
P.O. Box 375
602 Akureyri, Iceland
Tel: + 354 462 33 50
Fax: + 354 462 33 90
E-mail: snf@nattfs.is

Appendix II: Report from an *Ad Hoc* Group established at CAFF VI to provide the Plenary with advice on how to pursue the SAO request to "outline ideas and proposals for the sustainable use of Arctic renewable resources".

A) Mechanisms by which CAFF can contribute to the sustainable development initiative:

When a project has been proposed:

1. Evaluate its sustainability on the basis of existing information and expertise, if possible
2. Gather information needed for evaluation of its sustainability, if additional information is needed

When a project has been undertaken:

1. develop procedures to monitor its sustainability, and review the results.

B) CAFF activity categories.

1. Data compilation

- Vegetation mapping
- Beluga whale
- etc.

↓

2. Analysis

- Threats
- Gap analysis
- etc.

↓

3. Strategy

- Biodiversity Strategy

↓

4. Action Plans

- CPAN
- Murre Action Plan
- Eider Action Plan

↓

National implementation of measures

Appendix III: Report of an *Ad Hoc* group established at CAFF VI to have a closer look at the five priority objectives and to develop an outline of a long-term Action Plan for the Cooperative Strategy.

DRAFT CAFF STRATEGIC PLAN

INTRODUCTION

The "Cooperative Strategy for the Conservation of Biological Diversity in the Arctic Region" set out the broad context within which CAFF activities are undertaken. In Alta, June 1997, the Ministers of the Arctic countries welcomed the "Cooperative Strategy for the Conservation of Biological Diversity in the Arctic Region" and noted the intention to develop a long-term plan to give effect to the strategy. The framework document drafted by CAFF's analytical group provided an important step forward for focusing these activities into five objectives that form the basis of a CAFF strategic plan.

CAFF's mandate and scientific direction are provided by the AEPS, the Arctic Council Declaration, with additional direction coming from the Arctic Council through meetings of the Ministers and Senior Arctic Officials. General long-term guidance for CAFF programs is found in the Cooperative Strategy for the Conservation of Biological Diversity in the Arctic Region. This "CAFF Strategic Plan" further defines five objectives or program areas in which objectives are approved and reviewed each year in the CAFF Annual Work Plan, and are implemented by countries and other participants in CAFF, often as components of "Action Plans" for specific subjects.

STRATEGIC PLAN

The CAFF strategic plan is based on the following five objectives. In implementing actions to address those five objectives, emphasis will be given to incorporating the following:

1. The involvement of indigenous people and traditional ecological knowledge,
2. Effective communication with relevant audiences and decisions-makers and
3. The use of a broad, ecosystem-based approach.

Objective 1 (previously #5)

Enhance efforts to monitor components of Arctic ecosystems, detect changes, and identify and evaluate the causes of such changes.

Main Issues and Challenges. Monitoring provides a tool in which to detect changes in the environment and acts as an early warning system. The challenge is to develop such monitoring plans so they will be useful at different levels of the Arctic biodiversity, species, populations, habitats and ecosystems.

Objective 2 (previously #1)

Develop strategies and identify measures for the conservation of healthy and genetically diverse populations of Arctic species.

Main Issues and Challenges. Cooperative efforts should focus on maintaining healthy and genetically diverse populations of wild species, reversing declining trends, and restoring when necessary. Focus should be on species and populations which are shared by the Arctic countries or considered to be of common conservation concern among them, but are not yet sufficiently protected by existing agreements and treaties. Candidates for consideration include migratory species, seabirds, marine mammals, and rare and endangered plants and animals.

Objective 3 (previously #4)

Promote the coordinated establishment and maintenance of protected areas in the Arctic where they contribute to the conservation of biodiversity.

Main Issues and Challenges. Many protected areas already exist in the Arctic countries, covering about 15% of the Arctic region, but varying between countries from about 5 to 46%. Since the CPAN program has been endorsed for implementation, one of the major challenges is to identify how well these contribute to the conservation of Arctic ecosystems, habitats and species.

Objective 4 (previously #2)

Develop strategies and identify measures [activities] in addition to area protection to maintain overall integrity of Arctic ecosystems.

Main Issues and Challenges. As protected areas cover only a small part of the Arctic region, there is a need to look into the whole issue of habitat management outside protected areas, *inter alia* to support habitat conservation measures undertaken within CPAN. Ideally these efforts should be formulated in an overall habitat conservation strategy for the Arctic region. In more detail, CAFF efforts within this program area should primarily focus on protected areas' buffer zones, habitats which are unique for the Arctic, habitats which are important for Arctic species conservation measures, and efforts to remedy problems related to habitat mismanagement, such as overgrazing and erosion.

-

Objective 5 (previously #3)

Work to ensure that information on Arctic biodiversity is available for consideration by those making socio-economic decisions which may affect Arctic ecosystems, in particular, sensitive areas, communities, populations and species.

Main Issues and Challenges. Conservation and sustainable use of Arctic biological diversity can only be accomplished through integration and cooperation with the different sectors affecting and using these resources (e.g., agriculture, forestry, fisheries, water management, energy and industry, transport, tourism, regional policies, urban and rural planning).

<i>Objective:</i>	Monitoring	Species and population conservation	Protected areas	Conservation outside protected areas	Information on Socio-economic activities
<i>Process:</i>					
Identifying biodiversity (loss)					
Identifying threats					
Identifying objectives					
Designing measures					

Implementing measures					
Monitoring and reassessment					

Appendix IV: Results of discussion groups established at CAFF VI to refine CAFF's priority objectives and suggest future action areas.

Report of Discussion Group 1

Objective:

Enhance efforts to monitor components of Arctic ecosystems, detect changes, and identify and evaluate the causes of such changes.

Priority tasks/tentative action areas

Note: The following action areas are not in priority order, but in the order in which these tasks should be undertaken.

- Develop the framework of an Arctic Biodiversity Monitoring System to address the following questions:
 - Changes in species or habitats of particular interest (e.g. murrens or rare plants).
 - Changes in indicators of ecosystem health (e.g. top predators, health).
 - Evaluation of factors causing change (threats and natural factors).
- Conduct an overview of existing and proposed relevant monitoring programs for Arctic species and habitats, with reference to the following:
 - The three questions in action area A.
 - Three spatial scales of resolution (census, extensive, and intensive: *see note below*).
 - The degree of comparability of resulting information (including information throughout the range of migratory species).
- Following the completion of action areas A and B:
 - Identify a minimum core program for common implementation and immediate action in Arctic areas.
 - Identify gaps and assign priorities for addressing them.
 - Identify and evaluate sources of information on past changes (e.g. traditional knowledge, sediment cores and increment cores/tree rings).

Note: Spatial scales of resolution of monitoring approaches: 1. Census - total cover, by remote sensing (of habitat change); 2. Extensive - stratified sampling of set points (grid), at e.g. intervals of five years; 3. Intensive - sampling "representative" sites on annual or continuous basis e.g. long-term field stations, seabird colonies.

Report of Discussion Group 2

Objective:

Develop strategies and identify measures for the conservation of healthy and genetically diverse populations of Arctic species

-
-
-

Priority issues/tentative action areas

- Data gathering:
 - Identify species and populations of Arctic biodiversity and evaluate information needs.
 - Determine status and trends of populations.
 - Identify threats and trends of populations.
- Evaluate the potential conservation needs of transboundary species and populations that are not already addressed by international or regional agreements.
- Develop and implement conservation strategies for species and populations of common conservation concern.

Cross cutting issue: Encourage links to groups and activities outside of CAFF to promote the conservation of Arctic migratory populations.

Report of Discussion Group 3

Objective:

Promote the coordinated establishment and maintenance of protected areas in the Arctic where they contribute to the conservation of biodiversity.

Priority issues/tentative action areas

- Evaluate the contribution of the existing protected area system to conservation of ecosystems, habitats, species, and genetically diverse populations.
 - Develop or agree on an ecosystem classification system.
 - Collate existing arctic data.
 - Establish circumpolar criteria for identification of protected areas, including concepts of representativeness as well as biological "hot spots."
 - Gap analysis.
- Encourage development of initiatives and linkages outside the Arctic for conservation of migratory species.
 - Promote use of protected area strategies outside the arctic.
 - Identification of key habitats for migration and wintering.
 - Identify existing international agreements, processes, and conventions relevant to conservation of migratory arctic species.
 - Encourage national participation in relevant agreements.

Investigate opportunities for marine initiatives, including protected areas.

- See results from Canadian led focus group.
- Involve local and indigenous people and traditional ecological knowledge in the establishment and management of protected areas.
 - With indigenous people's organisations, evaluate existing use or non use of TEK and participation.
 - With indigenous people's organisations, develop a strategy and action plan to promote more effective use of TEK and involvement. Might use case studies, guidelines, or "best practices."
- Identify effects within protected areas of stressors from outside protected areas.
 - Conduct stock, species, and habitat sensitivity analysis.
 - For issues overlapping other AEPS programs, develop co-operative strategies.
- Identify and communicate values being protected.
 - Develop communication strategy.
 - Develop scope of work for an overview report summarising status of CAFF work completed to date.

- Communicate biological concerns regarding important threats.
- Communicate issues relevant to national participation in international conservation conventions.
- Communicate arctic biodiversity issues to temperate latitudes.

Report of Discussion Group 4

Objective:

Develop strategies and identify measures [approaches] in addition to area protection to maintain the overall integrity of Arctic ecosystems, and to form the basis of an Arctic Habitat Conservation Strategy.

Priority issues/tentative action areas

- Assessment of threats and impacts:
 - Assess impacts of land and resource use and the effectiveness of potential mitigation measures, to better understand the scope of threats from such activities.
 - Assess the impacts of habitat loss and fragmentation.

- Ecological information needs:
 - Identify key and sensitive habitats and variability in their use, including those in non-Arctic areas for migratory species.

- Review of planning principles and mechanisms:
 - Review principles and mechanisms for land-use planning and habitat conservation outside protected areas.
 - Review principles and mechanisms for marine habitat conservation.

Discussion Group 5: First Report

Objective:

Work to ensure that information on Arctic Biodiversity is available for consideration by those making socio-economic decisions which may effect Arctic ecosystems in particular: sensitive areas, communities, populations and species.

Main issues and challenges

Conservation and sustainable use of Arctic biological diversity can only be accomplished through integration and co-operation with the different sectors affecting and using these resources (e.g. agriculture, forestry, fisheries, water management, energy and industry, transport, tourism, regional politics, urban and rural planning).

Priority issues/tentative action areas

- Themes:
- Tourism.
- Transportation.
- Timberline forest.
- Grazing.
- [hunting and fisheries]*

*The US will not be able to agree to this category unless it specifically

excludes takes of marine mammals and/or trade in marine mammal products.

- Tools:
- Communication tools for differing decision makers and the general public.

Discussion Group 5: Second Report

Objective:

Develop strategies and identify measures [approaches] by which information on the conservation of Arctic biodiversity can be made available in an appropriate manner to those making socio-economic decisions.

Main issues and challenges

Conservation of Arctic biological diversity can only be accomplished through co-operation with, and participation of, the different sectors affecting and using these resources. This requires mechanisms by which biodiversity issues, concerns and values

are translated into forms in which they can be integrated for the full consideration of decision-makers from other sectors.

Priority issues/tentative action areas

- Review and evaluate existing principles and mechanisms for communicating information on and values of biodiversity.
- Identify priority target sectors for initial investigation.
- Examine sectoral interactions in and affecting indigenous communities, to highlight key communications issues.
- Develop specific strategies and approaches for target sectors.
- [Hold best practices workshops in co-operation with various sectors.]

Appendix V. Results of *Ad Hoc* discussion group at CAFF V which set out to amalgamate the discussion paper presented by the US and Canada, into one set of management recommendations.

PROPOSALS TO IMPROVE THE EFFICIENCY OF CAFF'S WORK

Proposal review and approval

1. All proposals are required to have an Executive Summary, following the format guidelines in the Canadian/Secretariat white paper (Appendix 1), as amended. This summary should not exceed 2 pages.
2. Authors are encouraged to also follow these format guidelines when preparing their detailed proposals.

3. The approval process will follow the steps outlined in section 3.0 of the white paper, except for the following:

a. Secretariat review (part 3) will only be to ensure that a proposal has an Executive Summary attached. If there is no summary, the proposal will be returned to the authors and not be circulated.

b. Acceptance of a project (part 5) will be a single step at the CAFF annual meetings. Proposals will either be approved or not, independent of their funding status.

4. Proposals must be received and circulated by the Secretariat no less than 60 days prior to the meeting at which they are to be considered.

5. As possible, reviewers who have concerns about specific proposals are encouraged to contact the authors/sponsors of proposals directly expressing those concerns prior to the meeting.

6. Proposals for associated projects should follow the same guidelines as for CAFF projects.

7. Associated projects that are approved by CAFF should be listed in an appendix to the CAFF work plan, with accompanying text noting that these projects are expected to benefit the work of CAFF, but are outside of CAFF's formal control.

Meeting agendas

1. An annotated draft agenda should be circulated 60 days in advance of the meeting.
2. Comments on the draft agenda are due back to the Secretariat 30 days prior to the meeting. These will be incorporated into the provisional agenda.
3. Provisional agenda will be considered for adoption, revised as necessary, and adopted at the start of the meeting.

Document management

1. Three types of documents: Progress Reports, Proposals and Working Papers, and Background Documents.
2. All documents tabled for consideration at the meeting will receive a number as outlined in the U.S. white paper.
3. All papers should list the title, author, date, and relevant agenda item.
4. Papers are to be submitted to the Secretariat for circulation no less than 60 days prior the meeting at which they are to be considered.
5. Papers arriving less than 60 days before the meeting will be considered at the discretion of the meeting.

Reporting

1. Prepare draft report during the meeting, for distribution prior to the meeting's conclusion.
2. Report prepared by rapporteurs and Secretariat.
3. Report to include a summary of all agreements achieved at the meeting.

Groups

1. Form 4-5 informal discussion groups to work on each of the "priority objectives".
2. Consider the types of projects that should be conducted over the next 5 years to contribute to the action areas.
3. Work by correspondence over the next year.

FORMAT GUIDELINES FOR PROJECT PROPOSALS SUBMITTED TO CAFF

For each proposal submitted to CAFF, an Executive Summary must be prepared. This summary is not to exceed two pages in length. Summaries should include the following items:

Title: A concise, one-sentence description of the project.

S
p
o
n
s
o
r
:

N
a

m
e

o
f

t
h
e

c
o
u
n
t
r
y

o
r

p
e
r
m
a
n
e
n
t

p
a
r
t
i
c
i
p
a
n
t

p
r
o

p
o
s
i
n
g

t
h
i
s

w
o
r
k
,

p
l
u
s

c
o
n
t
a
c
t

i
n
f
o
r
m
a
t
i
o
n

f
o
r

s
p
e
c
i
f
i
c

p
e
r
s
o
n
s

a
s

a
p
p
r
o
p
r
i
a
t
e
.

Partners: Identify any co-operating agencies or organisations.

R
a
t
i
o
n
a
l
e
:

A

s
u
m
m
a
r
y

o
f

h
o
w

t
h
e

p
r
o
j
e
c
t

r
e
l
a
t
e
s

t
o

C
A
F
F

m
a
n
d
a
t
e
s

a
n
d

p
r
i
o
r
i
t
i
e
s
,

p
l
u
s

a

d
e
s
c
r
i
p
t
i
o
n

o
f

e
x
p
e
c
t
e
d

a
p
p
l
i
c
a
t
i
o
n
s

o
f

r
e
s
u
l
t
s
·

O
b
j
e
c
t
i
v
e
s
:

A

s
t
a
t
e
m
e
n
t

o
f

w
h
a
t

i
s

t
o

b
e

a
c
h
i
e
v
e
d

.

G
e
o
g
r
a

p
h
i
c

s
c
o
p
e
:

D
e
s
c
r
i
b
e

t
h
e

g
e
o
g
r
a
p
h
i
c

f
o
c
u
s
,

a
s

a
p
p
r
o
p
r
i
a
t
e
.

P
r
o
j
e
c
t

d
e
s
i
g
n
:

D
e
s
c
r
i
b
e

t
h
e

p
r
o
p

o
s
e
d

p
r
o
j
e
c
t

i
n
c
l
u
d
i
n
g

s
c
o
p
e
,

m
e
t
h
o
d
s
,

a
n
d

o
t
h

e
r

i
n
f
o
r
m
a
t
i
o
n

e
n
s
u
r
i
n
g

t
h
a
t

t
h
e

p
r
o
j
e
c
t

i
s

f
u

l
l
y

u
n
d
e
r
s
t
o
o
d
.

Relevance to Describe how the proposed project relates to the traditional and
Indigenous People: cultural need, values, and practices of indigenous people.

O
t
h
e
r

r
e
l
a
t
e
d

p
r
o
j
e
c
t
s
:

L
i
s
t

r
e
l
a
t
e
d

o
n
g
o
i
n
g

e
f
f
o
r
t
s

o
u
t
s
i
d
e

o
f

C
A
F
F

a

n
d

h
o
w

t
h
e

p
r
o
p
o
s
e
d

p
r
o
j
e
c
t

w
o
u
l
d

a
d
d

t
o

o
r

c
o

m
p
l
e
m
e
n
t
t

t
h
o
s
e

e
f
f
o
r
t
s
·

S
c
h
e
d
u
l
e
:

I
n
d
i
c
a
t
e

t
h
e

d
a
t
e
s

f
o
r

t
h
e

b
e
g
i
n
n
i
n
g

a
n
d

c
o
m
p
l
e
t
i
n
g

o
f

e
a
c

h

p
h
a
s
e

o
f

t
h
e

p
r
o
j
e
c
t

a
n
d

t
h
e

d
u
r
a
t
i
o
n

o
f

t
h
e

p
r
o
j
e
c
t
.

A
n
t
i
c
i
p
a
t
e
d

o
u
t
p
u
t
s
:

I
d
e
n
t
i
f
y

t
h
e

e
x

p
e
c
t
e
d

r
e
s
u
l
t
s

a
n
d
/
o
r

p
r
o
d
u
c
t
s
.

F
u
n
d
i
n
g

s
o
u
r
c
e

s
:

I
n
d
i
c
a
t
e

t
h
e

e
s
t
i
m
a
t
e
d

c
o
s
t
s

o
f

t
h
e

p
r
o
p
o
s
e

d

w

o

r

k

,

a

n

d

t

h

e

s

o

u

r

c

e

s

o

f

c

o

n

f

i

r

m

e

d

o

r

p

r

o

p

o

s

e
d

f
u
n
d
i
n
g

(
a

d
e
t
a
i
l
e
d

b
u
d
g
e
t

i
s

n
o
t

n
e
c
e
s
s
a
r
y

)
.

Appendix VI:

CAFF WORK PLAN 1997-98

I. INTRODUCTION

CAFF's mandate and scientific direction are provided by the AEPS Declaration (1991) and the Arctic Council Declaration (1996), with additional directions provided by the AEPS and the Arctic Council through meetings of the Ministers and Senior Arctic Officials (SAOs).

General long-term guidance for the CAFF Program is found in the *Cooperative Strategy* for the Conservation of Biological Diversity in the Arctic Region. The *Cooperative Strategy* sets out the broad context within which CAFF activities are undertaken. In Alta, June 1997, the Ministers of the Arctic countries welcomed the *Cooperative Strategy* and noted the intention to develop a long-term plan to give it effect, based on five of its objectives identified as priorities by the CAFF Management Board and Permanent Participants. These objectives are:

1. Support and implement measures for the conservation of Arctic genetic resources, species and their habitats.

1. Manage activities outside protected areas in order to maintain the ecological integrity of protected areas and to ensure the conservation of biodiversity.
2. Enhance integration of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use objectives into sectoral and cross-sectoral plans and policies.
3. Establish protected areas in the Arctic where they contribute to the conservation of ecosystems, habitats and species.
4. Enhance efforts to monitor Arctic biological diversity, paying particular attention to species, populations, habitats and ecosystems which are of greatest ecological, cultural and social value.

The long-term plan (Strategic Plan) meant to give effect to the *Cooperative Strategy* is under development with the intention to table the first draft at the SAO meeting in early 1998. This Strategic Plan will define further the five objectives or program areas in which CAFF's activities are to be focused over a five-year period. Following Arctic Council endorsement of a final draft, the Strategic Plan will serve as the framework for future annual CAFF Work Plans.

In Alta, the Senior Arctic Affairs Officials (SAAOs) further directed CAFF to prioritise the following activities:

- Continue the implementation and further development of the "Circumpolar Protected Areas Network Strategy and Action Plan".
- assist countries with the implementation of the "International Murre Conservation Strategy and Action Plan" and the "Circumpolar Eider Conservation Strategy and Action Plan" as needed.
- Finish other ongoing projects as feasible and appropriate.
- Outline ideas and proposals regarding the conservation and sustainable use of Arctic renewable resources.
- Report on all priority tasks at future Arctic Council meetings.

In addition the SAAOs noted that they look forward to receiving the following CAFF products:

- Atlas of Rare Endemic Vascular Plants of the Arctic (date not specified).
- Threats to Arctic Biological Diversity (January 1998).
- Incidental Mortality of Seabirds in Commercial Fisheries in Circumpolar Countries (date not specified).
- Human Disturbance Guidelines for Seabird Colonies (date not specified).
- Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Map (by year 2001).

- Recommendations on Procedural and Organisational Aspects for the CAFF Program (as soon as possible).

Until the long-term Strategic Plan is endorsed by the Arctic Council, CAFF adopts this Annual Work Plan with focus on the assignments set in Alta, including emphasis on finishing ongoing program work. A few new tasks have been added, all with deadlines before the next Arctic Council meeting in 1998.

CAFF program activities, sponsored by at least one Arctic country, are listed under the five priority objectives endorsed in Alta or under the heading of Program Management.

CAFF acknowledges that several programs and projects outside of CAFF are consistent with its purpose. To avoid duplication of effort, these programs and projects are invited to inform CAFF of their activities, and if so desired, to cooperate with CAFF for mutual benefit - at no additional financial cost for CAFF. These projects are termed "associated projects" and are listed in a separate section.

-

II. CAFF TASKS

1. Support and implement measures for the conservation of Arctic genetic resources, species and their habitats

1.1 Rare Circumpolar Endemic Arctic Vascular Plants

1.1.i) Publish the Atlas of Rare Endemic Vascular Plants of the Arctic as a CAFF Technical Report in 1998; establish a website for the Atlas and link it to the CAFF website by June 1998.

Lead: United States

1.1.ii) Specify, by CAFF VII, the list of rare non-endemic plant species of circumpolar concern on the

basis of the draft prepared by Russia, and annotate it according to the scheme accepted for the endemic plants.

Lead: Russia

1.2 Pan-Arctic Flora Initiative

1.2.i) Finalise, by CAFF VII, the first draft of the annotated checklist of "Pan-Arctic Flora: Vascular Plants".

Lead: Russia

1.3 Conservation of Arctic Seabirds

1.3.i) Implement the International Murre Conservation Strategy and Action Plan by completing five-year action plans for each circumpolar country in 1997. At CAFF VII, report on each country's progress in implementing the murre strategy, including the status of the circumpolar murre catalogue database (Canada/USA), the murre monitoring plan (USA), the North Atlantic murre banding plan (Iceland), and the North Atlantic murre banding recoveries report (Norway).

Lead: As noted

1.3.ii) Implement the Circumpolar Eider Conservation Strategy and Action Plan by completing

national five-year action plans by CAFF VII.

Lead: All

1.3.iii) Complete, by December 1997, CAFF Technical Reports, including "Harvest of Seabirds" (Greenland/US), "Incidental Mortality of Seabirds in Commercial Fisheries" (Norway), and "Human Disturbance Guidelines at Seabird Colonies" (Canada), as well as the third edition of the "Circumpolar Seabird Bulletin" in 1998 (US).

Lead: As noted

1.4 Migratory Birds Outside the Arctic

1.4.i) Complete the CAFF Technical Report "Global Overview of the Conservation of Arctic Migratory Species" and summarise the report's recommendations for presentation to the SAO meeting in April 1998.

Lead: Russia in co-operation with the Netherlands and the Bonn Convention Secretariat

1.5 Circumpolar Database on Terrestrial Migratory Species

1.5.i) Continue compiling a circumpolar GIS database of the breeding and moulting areas of terrestrial migratory bird species and prepare a progress report by CAFF VII.

Lead: Russia, in collaboration with the World Conservation and Monitoring Centre (WCMC)

and Wetlands International

1.6 Threatened Species and Species of Common Conservation Concern

1.6.i) Complete, by May 1998, an evaluation of the feasibility of adding CAFF lists of rare and vulnerable species and species of common conservation concern in the circumpolar Arctic to

the CAFF website.

Lead Canada in c-operation with the CAFF Secretariat

2. Manage activities outside protected areas in order to maintain the ecological integrity of protected areas and to ensure the conservation of biodiversity

2.1 Report on Threats to Arctic Biodiversity

2.1.i) Circulate to countries, by 1 November 1997, the next version of draft Report on Threats to

Arctic Biodiversity (Finland); provide comments to Finland by December 1, 1997 (All); submit

the final draft to the SAO meeting in January 1998 (Finland).

Lead: As noted

2.2 Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Mapping Project (CAVM)

2.2.i) Continue efforts to complete the Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Map and prepare a progress

report for CAFF VII.

Lead: The United States

2.3 Ice Edge Ecosystem Pilot Mapping Project

2.3.i) Complete, by CAFF VII, habitat maps and descriptions for bowhead whales, polar bears and

walrus.

***Lead: The United States in co-operation
with the Arctic Network***

3. Enhance integration of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use objectives into sectoral and cross-sectoral plans and policies

-

-

3.1 Report on Sustainable Use of Northern Timberline Forests

3.1.i) Prepare, by January 1998, a discussion paper for circulation (Finland); provide comments to

Finland by March 1998 (All); hold a workshop on Sustainable Use of Northern Timberline

Forests in Whitehorse, May 10-11, 1998 (in conjunction with the Arctic Sustainable

Development Conference), using the discussion paper as a background document (Finland);

by July 1998, publish proceedings of workshop for use in other Arctic fora (Finland).

Lead: As noted

4. Establish protected areas in the Arctic where they contribute to the conservation of ecosystems, habitats and species

4.1 Circumpolar Protected Areas Network (CPAN)

Gap Analysis for CPAN

4.1.i) Conduct a limited gap analysis for the Russian Arctic territory related to selected priority

themes (based on existing data sets and ongoing CAFF activities), and present a report to

CAFF VII.

Lead: Russia in cooperation with UNEP/GRID-Arendal and WCMC

Pan-Arctic Protected Areas Registry (PAPAR)

4.1.ii) Review, by December 1997, the Discussion Paper on Structure and Functions of a Pan-Arctic

Protected Areas Registry (PAPAR), and provide input on this to Norway (All). Based on the

inputs, by CAFF VII, present a draft version of a PAPAR of terrestrial, freshwater and marine

candidate sites for future action (Norway in cooperation with UNEP/GRID-Arendal).

Lead: As noted

CPAN Implementation Reporting and Evaluation Guide

4.1.iii) Review, by December 1997, the Draft CPAN Implementation Reporting and Evaluation Guide,

and provide input on this to the CAFF Secretariat (All). Based on this input, by May 1998, complete the CPAN Implementation Reporting and Evaluation Guide (CAFF Secretariat). Using the revised Guide, undertake a full evaluation of national implementation of CPAN by CAFF VIII (All). (Lead to prepare a report based on these national reports will be identified at CAFF VII).

Lead: As noted

Marine Protected Areas

4.1.iv) Prepare, for the May 1998 meeting of the National Representatives and Permanent Participants,

a paper summarising the jurisdictional responsibilities for Arctic marine ecosystems and national

frameworks for conservation of the Arctic marine environment.

Lead: Canada

Sacred Lands as a Part of CPAN

4.1.v) Prepare, by August 1998, a discussion paper "Possibilities for including sacred lands and

graveyards of the indigenous people in the CPAN framework."

Lead: RAIPON in cooperation with Canada and Russia

5. Enhance efforts to monitor Arctic biological diversity, paying particular attention to species, populations, habitats and ecosystems which are of greatest ecological, cultural and social value

5.1 Monitoring Biological Diversity

Overview

5.1.i) Compile, by April 1998, an overview of current biological monitoring efforts in the Arctic.

Lead: Greenland

Biodiversity Monitoring Network

5.1.ii) Prepare, by August 1998, a progress report on the Biodiversity Monitoring Network at the

local flora level in the Asian Arctic, in the context of the general task of creating a

circumpolar Arctic biodiversity monitoring network.

Lead: Russia

6. CAFF ASSOCIATED PROJECTS

6.1. A Circumpolar Case Study on Tourism in Relation to CPAN

6.1.i) Develop a Circumpolar Case Study on tourism in relation to protected areas using existing

or potential CPAN sites and methodology and design selected by the CAFF countries. The

Study will show how the countries are addressing the increase in nature-based tourism and

the impacts on biodiversity and will cover, inter alia, conservation measures, tourism data

collection and assessment, and involvement of local communities.

*Phase one: Site selection, study methodology and design
(May 1998)*

*Phase two: Implementation, analysis and reporting
(1999/2000)*

Lead: IUCN

7. PROGRAM MANAGEMENT

7.1 CAFF Program Delivery

CAFF Strategic Plan

7.1.i) Prepare, by November 1, 1997, a discussion outline of the CAFF Strategic Plan (Iceland in co-

operation with the CAFF Secretariat); prepare first draft of the Strategic Plan for submission

to SAOs by January 1998 (CAFF Secretariat in cooperation with All).

Lead: As noted

CAFF Communication Strategy

7.1.ii) Develop, by April 1998, an outline for a communication strategy for CAFF.

*Lead: Iceland in cooperation with UNEP GRID-Arendal
and the CAFF Secretariat*

CAFF Operating Guidelines

7.1.iii) Prepare, by September 1998, draft operating guidelines for the CAFF Program for approval

by the SAOs.

Lead: Canada and the United States

Translation of CAFF Documents into Russian

7.1.iv) Translate into Russian, by August 1998, a set of documents and reports of CAFF beginning

with the CAFF Technical Report "Global Overview of the Conservation of Arctic Migratory

Species" and the CAFF Habitat Conservation Reports.

Lead: Russia in cooperation with the Netherlands

7.2 Future Meetings of the CAFF International Working Group

May 1999 - Canada

Fall 2000 - Norway