

CAFF Board Meeting, Uppsala, August 29-30, 2001

Draft Summary Report

1. Introduction and adoption of the Agenda (Chair)

Sune Sohlberg, CAFF Chair, welcomed participants to the second CAFF Board meeting this year. He specifically welcomed new representatives: Kenton Wohl, CAFF National Representative for the U.S., Gunn Britt Retter representative from the Indigenous Peoples Secretariat, and Kristina Åkesson from the U.S. Embassy in Stockholm. Participants then introduced themselves (Appendix I).

The agenda was adopted with some re-arranging of Agenda Items (Appendix II)

2. Adoption of Report from CAFF Board Meeting in April (Chair)

The report from the CAFF Board meeting in Stockholm, April 3-5, 2001 (BMII-01/2-1) was adopted..

3. Review of management since April

➤ Report from Rovaniemi Anniversary

The Chair provided a brief report on the AC Chairs and SDWG meetings in Rovaniemi, April 5-7, 2001, as well as the AEPS Anniversary and SAO meeting in Rovaniemi, June 11-13, 2001. The main topic of the Chairs meeting was Pekka Haavisto's report. Discussions were lively and open. CAFF emphasised the need to coordinate monitoring activities with AMAP and activities related to use of living resources with SDWG. The SDWG meeting reported on many interesting projects, which CAFF should be aware of, including capacity building, freshwater fisheries management, sustainable reindeer husbandry, and sustainable use of northern timberline forests.

For the Anniversary, the Chair and Secretariat prepared necessary documents. The delivery of the CAFF Overview, overseen by Finland, went well and it received good attention and high praises. The Chair again thanked all the countries for providing the necessary resources to prepare and deliver this important product of CAFF. Participants reported on press activities. Some National Representatives have already briefed the press about the report. Others decided to wait until after summer holidays and until the report has been widely distributed.

The meeting took note of the Chair's report regarding management activities since April 2001.

The Chair requested CAFF representatives to send the Secretariat information about PR activity related to the CAFF Overview Report.

➤ **Report from the SAO-meeting.**

Participants reviewed the draft SAO report (BMII-01/3-2). Some felt that bullet four under 7.2 CAFF (“The SAOs encouraged CAFF to continue its efforts to avoid overlapping ...) could be misinterpreted. Also that the last sentence under 7.2 (“CAFF promised the unsolved management issues in ECORA-project will be settled before the November SAO meeting” was too strong.

Decision:

The Secretariat will request the AC Secretariat to change wording of these sentences to clarify their meaning.

4. Pekka Haavisto’s report on restructuring of the Arctic Council

The Chair introduced and noted that the report had been discussed briefly at the last SAO meeting. The AC Chair, Peter Stenlund, has now initiated bilateral discussions with the Member States regarding the recommendations of the report. Based on these bilateral discussions, he will prepare a discussion paper for the next SAO (November 6-7). According to Stenlund there may not be any drastic new ideas regarding CAFF.

Countries reported on internal reviews of Haavisto’s report. In most cases, this is still in progress. The U.S. informed, however, that they have completed a fairly thorough review of the report and sent extensive comments to the AC Chair. With respect to CAFF, the U.S. supports maintaining the biodiversity monitoring element within CAFF with a common AMAP/CAFF database. The U.S. also feels that the CPAN marine element should be better coordinated with marine initiatives in other WGs.

Russia and Iceland supported the view that CAFF should maintain coordination of biodiversity monitoring, although a common database could be a good idea. Several participants noted that there is a need to reinforce cooperation with the other WGs, e.g. through regular meetings of WG Chairs. It was also noted that the division of labour between CAFF and SDWG is still unclear.

The Chair summarised by emphasising the general need for good collaboration among working groups.

Highlights

- *CAFF agreed that there is ongoing need for coordination among WGs to avoid overlap and duplication, e.g. between CAFF and AMAP regarding monitoring, between CAFF and SDWG regarding use of living resources, between CAFF-CPAN marine activities and PAME/EPPR. WGs Chairs should ensure such coordination.*
- *Several countries noted that CAFF should retain biodiversity monitoring as a major focus of work.*
- *No formal message will be sent to Finland regarding Haavisto’s report at this time.*

5. CPAN

➤ **Report from the CPAN Standing Committee (SC)**

The U.S. reported and tabled an outline of a CPAN website. The U.S. suggested that the outline be mounted on either the USFWS or CAFF website for review by the CPAN Standing Committee members and CAFF representatives. The U.S. further reported that the US/Russian CPAN National Action Plan (1997) had been sent out for information.

The Executive Secretary suggested that the CPAN website, once reviewed, be integrated with the revised CAFF website planned for by the end of this year.

Decision:

- *The CPAN website outline will be mounted on US FWS website for review by the CPAN Standing Committee and CAFF Representatives.*
- *A final version will be integrated with CPAN information on a revised CAFF website, planned for by the end of 2001.*

➤ **Recommendations for actions in the marine environment based on discussion paper from the *ad hoc* CPAN marine group (Canada)**

Canada introduced this item and referred to a discussion paper (BMII-01/5-2a), initially tabled at the CAFF Board meeting in April, 2001. At that meeting, CAFF had decided to defer decisions pending clarification on the actual meaning of some of the recommendations, and information on what PAME and EPPR have been doing. In this regard, he referred to an explanatory note from the Secretariat (BMII-01/2b).

With respect to recommendation #2, the U.S. noted that Canada and the U.S. have begun to coordinate their marine classification systems and that NOAA is preparing a discussion paper, which might help focus the issue. With respect to recommendation # 1, the Secretariat informed that EPPR's Map of Resources at Risk from Oils Spills has not yet been published. The Secretariat further informed that PAME, at their last meeting, had decided to not address the CMW recommendations until they have received a proposal from CAFF. Participants felt that recommendations #3 and #4 could easily be amalgamated into one.

Decision

- *CAFF reviewed the list of four recommendations provided by the CPAN CMW discussion paper (CAFF BMII-01/5-2a) and agreed in principle on the priority order provided by the paper.*
- *CAFF adopted recommendation #3 with modifications as follows: "Complete a compendium of ecologically important marine areas as a basis for further*

development of CPAN, as well as a basis for preparing any relevant guidelines for marine user groups.

- *The CPAN Standing Committee is requested to scope recommendation #3 further and prepare a proposal (including funding options) for the next Board meeting of CAFF in spring of 2002.*
- *CAFF agreed to defer decision regarding recommendation #2 until after review of a discussion paper (white paper) being prepared by the U.S.*
- *CAFF agreed to defer decision regarding recommendation #1 until EPPR's work regarding the Map of Resources at Risk from Oils Spills has been published.*

➤ **Discussion paper on Full Value of Arctic Protected Areas**

Canada introduced the discussion paper (BMII-01/5-4) and noted *inter alia* that the topic of full value of natural resources is currently of high political interest. No country had as of yet commented the paper. The CAFF Secretariat had commented and suggested that the time up to the Fourth AC Ministerial in fall 2002 be spent on further scoping and securing resources for the project, which would then run for two years with the aim to deliver a report to Ministers in 2004.

Countries were in general supportive of the project, but noted that Canada and the U.S. are far ahead in dealing with this issue and that in some countries the necessary level of competence to fully participate is non-existent.

Decision:

- *Countries will provide comments to Canada by 15th October.*
- *CAFF agreed to give the CPAN SC the task of developing the proposal further, including scoping out the work and resources required, and providing a revised draft to the next CAFF Board meeting in spring of 2002*

➤ **Interim report on the Sacred Sites project (RAIPON)**

RAIPON highlighted main results and challenges of the project so far. On the positive side the project has spurred high interest from local authorities in Russia and the outside world. Northern regions of Russia currently not involved, such as Murmansk, Nenets, Chukotka, and Habarovsk, have expressed an interest in participating. On the basis of this work, a network of experts, including native peoples, has been organised. RAIPON has been pleasantly surprised about the willingness of respondents to openly discuss the issue of sacred sites. RAIPON has furthermore made a preliminary agreement with Koryak and Yamolo-Nenets authorities to make legislative changes/improvements to secure protection of sacred sites.

The main challenge of the project work so far has been related to logistics. Most of the relevant respondents live and work in remote places, which are difficult to access. In this regard, RAIPON has received great help from local authorities, who have provided transport without charging for it. However, due to logistical problems, field work will not be completed until the end of September, or early October.

Russia advised RAIPON not to forget the original intention to integrate protection of sacred sites with legislation on conservation of natural heritage.

CAFF welcomed and took note of the report provided by RAIPON.

➤ **CPAN Standing Committee meeting.**

Participants discussed the need for a CPAN SC meeting in light of decisions made regarding CPAN. It was furthermore noted that the first CPAN SC meeting in Trondheim, September 11, 2000, had not been able to finalise all the business at hand.

Decision

- *CAFF agreed that there is a need for a CPAN SC meeting to work on tasks assigned by the Board in Uppsala, 2001, and to continue other ongoing work initiated at the first CPAN SC meeting in Trondheim, September 11, 2000.*
- *The U.S. will investigate holding such a meeting in 2001 or early 2002.*

6. Biodiversity monitoring

Iceland introduced the discussion paper on Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program (CBMP) (BMII-01/6-1).

RAIPON noted that indigenous peoples were not mentioned in the paper. Iceland explained that participation by indigenous peoples in the networks is taken for granted. Johan Hammar noted that at least two indigenous peoples representatives are involved in the Arctic char network. The Secretariat noted that a community based monitoring element is still planned, but that so far it had been difficult to find a coordinator.

➤ **Status of networks (Iceland)**

Johan Hammar (Sweden), coordinator for the Arctic Char Network, reported on progress and experiences. He referred to a detailed status report tabled at CAFF VIII. Twenty-five experts from all eight countries registered initially, but he has so far been unable to raise money for a “kick off” meeting or core activities. Monitoring still seems to be a penalty word in funding applications. The work currently, therefore, focuses on building upon individual enthusiasm. Johan Hammar circulated a one-pager (Appendix III) outlining tentative work for a prospective coordinator.

Iceland added that with respect to the other networks, not much has happened since the CAFF Board meeting in April, 2001. The Seabird network is assessing impacts of climate change on seabirds in the circumpolar region and has initiated work on murre monitoring. The Seabird network encourages annual meetings as a way of advancing work. The ITEX recently had a Synthesis Workshop in Boulder Colorado. ITEX is

having difficulty in funding some of their sites. Applications to Nordic Arctic Research Program (NARP) have been unsuccessful.

Canada reported on a conversation with Ian Sterling (IUCN Polar Bear Specialist Board). This group meets every 2-3 years and compiles circumpolar status and trends information on polar bears. Contacts have been made with the North American contact for the Goose Specialist Group, who recommended that CAFF formulate special questions for the group to address. Canada has also been discussing the possibility of organising Reindeer network workshop early next year.

CAFF welcomed and took note of status reports provided by Johan Hammar (Sweden), Iceland and Canada.

➤ **Discussion on how to organise the biodiversity monitoring work**

UNEP noted that WCMC and GRID-Arendal have been discussing to offer a meta-database function for the CAFF monitoring and other AC relevant work. They have had informal discussions with the Global Terrestrial Observation System (GTOS) and would be happy to prepare a proposal on this for CAFF.

CAFF welcomed the offer by UNEP-WCMC to prepare a proposal to CAFF (including funding options) to host and oversee a meta-database containing information and data from the monitoring networks, as well as from other projects of CAFF.

Participants discussed the next steps and agreed that there is a need to step-up support to the networks and to organise a meeting between CAFF and the network coordinators. In terms of deliverables to Ministers, participants agreed that it would be important for CAFF to a) table a convincing plan for the biodiversity monitoring program focusing on organisation and funding, b) prepare a joint CAFF/AMAP message regarding collaboration and integration.

Participants went through the CBMP discussion paper (BMII-01/6-1).

Decision:

CAFF adopted in principle the proposals set forth in the CBMP discussion paper (BMII-01/6.1) as follows:

- *Countries will continue to search for options to support the networks – e.g. through hosting consultation meetings.*
- *The CAFF Secretariat will work with the network coordinators to apply for long-term core funds from national and international funding agencies and organisations (e.g. EU, NSF, NRC, Nordic Council, Arctic Council).*
- *Iceland will continue the overall lead for the CAFF biodiversity monitoring work*
- *The support group established at the CAFF Board meeting, April 3-5, 2001, will continue under the leadership of Iceland. The meeting welcomed Christoph Zöeckler, UNEP, as a new member of this group.*

- *Iceland will host a meeting between the network coordinators and CAFF (support group) in late 2001 or early 2002.*
- *CAFF will consider participation in/contribution to the AMAP meeting on biological effects in January 2002 in Tromsø, Norway.*
- *IPS and Permanent Participants will be offered a seat on the proposed CAFF/AMAP joint monitoring coordination group.*

7. Arctic Climate Impact Assessment

UNEP-WCMC introduced a Report on Impacts of Climate Change on Wildlife, based on the results of field work in the Russian Arctic. It was suggested that the report be sent to David Klein, lead author for Chapter 10 on Wildlife and Conservation in ACIA.

➤ Status report/update

Pål Prestrud, ACIA Vice-chair, reported on progress in ACIA since CAFF VIII (Appendix IV). A Scenario workshop held in Stockholm, January 2001, decided to use a conservative overall scenario for ACIA, predicting 2-5 °C warming by 2070. Regional scenarios will need to be worked out. Another challenge is to incorporate paleological scenarios, which predict more abrupt changes than climatic scenarios alone. The ACIA Workshop in St. Petersburg was very successful in identifying additional Russian authors. The number of authors in ACIA is currently 130 with good representation from all Arctic countries. Writing teams are in place and have either had their first workshop or are planning to do so before the next Assessment Steering Committee meeting in Ottawa, December 3-5, 2001. IPCC now considers ACIA as an important part of the next IPCC report scheduled for 2003. The chairman of IPCC WG1 has been invited to participate in ASC meetings. Overall, the ACIA is on well on track.

CAFF welcomed and took note of the progress report delivered by Pål Prestrud, ACIA Vice-chair, and expressed satisfaction with the development of ACIA.

➤ ACIA GEF Application

The Executive Secretary introduced an application to GEF (BMII-01/11-1), prepared mostly by the AMAP Secretariat and GRID-Arendal. The purpose is to assist Russia in providing data to and participating in ACIA. The Executive Secretary noted that CAFF needs to decide if and how it should be involved in this application. He noted further that early input by the CAFF Secretariat had not been adequately incorporated and that the current application had a rather strong physical focus and, in his view, did not evenly address the needs of ACIA.

Participants agreed that biodiversity aspects needed to be addressed in any application from CAFF. They requested further clarification from Russia what the intended purpose and focus of the application was.

Decision:

- *CAFF agreed that the biodiversity component of ACIA needs to be adequately covered in any joint CAFF/AMAP application to GEF.*
- *CAFF agreed on the need to clarify Russian expectations and priorities regarding use of additional GEF funds for ACIA. The Executive Secretary will write a letter to Amirkhan Amirkhanov, requesting clarification before additional resources are spent on project development.*

➤ **Plan for preparing the ACIA Policy Document**

The Executive Secretary introduced a draft plan (AMAP/CAFF 2/3/1) prepared by him and Lars-Otto Reiersen, AMAP Secretariat. Participants noted that the timeline suggested seemed tight and that a drafting team should be established early to start discussing the structure and format of the document.

Decision:

- *CAFF agreed that the timeline provided in the draft Plan (AMAP/CAFF 2/3/1) is too tight and that Drafting Team members should be identified no later than spring 2002.*

8. GEF ECORA project

➤ **Status report/update (Norway)**

Norway introduced Thor Larsen, Chair of ECORA, who presented a report on the ECORA project. Thor Larsen reviewed the structure and organisation of the PDF-B project, the main purpose of which is to secure the writing of a quality Project Brief for the Full Project. The total budget is approximately 800 000 USD, of which 370 000 is cash provided by GEF, Norway, Canada, the Nordic Council, Finland and the Netherlands. There is still a shortage of cash to complete all PDF-B activities as planned. Challenges so far have included harmonising different perspectives of project participants. Also, there has been 2-3 month delay, pending a decision on internal organisation in Russia. Most of these challenges have been worked out now and the project is moving once again. Currently, the main task is to organise fact-finding missions to the five participating Arctic regions of Russia. One region, Yamalo-Nenets has withdrawn from the project.

Thor Larsen concluded by noting that although coordination has been quite a challenge, he firmly believes that the project is a good one with much potential for biodiversity conservation in Arctic Russia. He finally appealed to countries to provide

additional financial support to the PDF-B phase in order to secure a quality Project Brief.

RAIPON noted surprise that Yamalo-Nenets has withdrawn from the project, especially in light of RAIPON president, Sergei Haruchi's, strong support to the project. RAIPON further expressed concern that participation of indigenous peoples was not adequately secured in fact-finding missions and the project as a whole.

Participants agreed that it is essential to secure full and thorough involvement of indigenous peoples in the project. Thor Larsen offered to contact Elena Armand, CPPI, and notify her of the discussions.

CAFF welcomed and took note of the progress report delivered by Thor Larsen.

Decision:

- *CAFF agreed on the need to have full involvement of RAIPON representatives in the fact-finding missions to Arctic regions of Russia, and during planning and implementation of the ECORA project*
- *The ECORA Chair will contact the Russian Coordinator, Elena Armand, and inform her about CAFF's decision.*

9. Circumpolar Seabird Working Group:

Kenton Wohl, CSWG chair and U.S. National Representative for CAFF reported and tabled the minutes from 7th meeting of the CSWG in Helsinki, October 24-26, 2000. He informed about the 8th meeting of CSWG, which is planned for September 19-23, in Anchorage, Alaska. This meeting will focus on recommendations regarding seabird bycatch, seabird harvest, and the protection of migratory birds outside the Arctic. Therefore it is important that CAFF National Representatives organise internal discussions on these issues prior to the meeting.

CAFF welcomed and took note of the progress report delivered by the CSWG Chair.

Decision:

- *CAFF National Representatives will contact CSWG representatives and ensure that national discussions are held prior to the next CSWG meeting, scheduled for Anchorage, September 17-22, 2001, regarding main agenda items such as seabird bycatch, seabird harvest, conservation migratory birds outside the Arctic, and national implementation of murre and eider strategies.*
- *CAFF agreed that CSWG, in their discussions, should be mindful of the process of developing CAFF recommendations to Ministers, based on the CAFF Overview Report, as well as upcoming global opportunities to highlight Arctic specific issues, such as the WSSD in Johannesburg.*

➤ **Migratory Bird Workshop Report recommendations**

The recommendations from the Migratory Bird Workshop in Sognli, September 11, 2000, were discussed briefly.

Decision:

- *CAFF agreed that the CSWG should focus on scoping the first three recommendations of Migratory Bird Workshop.*

10. CAFF Flora Group

➤ **First meeting report and recommendations**

The U.S. noted that Flora Group Chair is still in the field and has been unavailable for discussion. The report from the first Flora Group meeting in Uppsala, March 2001, will be sent out soon after he returns.

CAFF took note of the progress report delivered by the U.S. and looks forward to receiving the report from the first FG workshop in Uppsala with recommendations to CAFF .

11. Coordination with other AC and Northern activities:

➤ **AMAP – CAFF/AMAP joint meeting**

See discussion under Item 7

Decision:

- *CAFF agreed to table the CBMP discussion paper (BMII-01/6-1) as a draft at the joint AMAP/CAFF meeting*
- *CAFF agreed to propose to AMAP that the two WGs seek concurrence from the AC Ministerial in 2002 to develop an Integrated Arctic Monitoring Program during 2002-2004 for adoption at the AC Ministerial in fall of 2004.*

➤ **CAFF/PAME collaboration on marine conservation**

The Chair and Secretariat informed that PAME is waiting for a proposal from CAFF regarding potential collaboration on marine conservation related to CPAN. They further informed that PAME had requested to be involved in the development of the ACIA Policy Document.

Decision:

- *The Chair and Secretariat will write a letter to PAME informing them about discussions at this meeting, pertaining to CPAN-CMW, and inviting them to join the process of developing recommendation #3, e.g. through attending the planned CPAN Standing Committee meeting.*

- *CAFF welcomed PAME's participation in developing the ACIA Policy Document.*

➤ **SDWG – projects on sustainable use of living resources**

Miliza Malmelin (Finland), SDWG Secretary, briefed the meeting about three SDWG projects, which might be of interest to CAFF:

- The Sustainable Reindeer Husbandry project, led by Norway, focuses on clarifying management and economics of reindeer husbandry in the North through interviews with reindeer herders on issues such as household, community structure, family, predation, markets, legal status, etc. The project has a full time coordinator, based in Tromsø, Norway. A workshop is planned for in Kautokeino, in spring of 2002. The project aims to deliver a final report to the AC Ministerial meeting in fall of 2002. Coordinator: Johnny-Leo L. Jernsletten (johnny.jernsletten@sami.uit.no); www.reindeer-husbandry.uit.no
- The Sustainable Timberline project, led by Finland, focuses on ecological as well as developmental issues in the northern timberline zone. The main activity is an international workshop in May 2002. The workshop will prepare recommendations to the AC Ministerial in fall of 2002. Coordinator: Marja-Liisa Sutinen (marja-liisa.sutinen@tla.fi)
- The Fisheries Management and Coastal Fisheries projects, led by the Saami Council, have had financial difficulties and little information is available.

CAFF welcomed and took note of the information provided by the SDWG Secretary.

12. Recommendations based on the CAFF Overview Report

➤ **Introduction of an outline of recommendations, based on the CAFF overview report and other ongoing work of CAFF**

The Secretariat introduced a draft prepared in advance of the meeting (BMII-01/12-1).

Participants were of the opinion that the current draft was unclear in terms of the intended audience and provided far too detailed recommendations. Some felt it read more like a work plan for CAFF rather than high-level policy document. If the document is intended for the Ministers it needs only to provide two basic things: identify the main problems and challenges and suggest general ways to address them. A second task would be to develop an Action Plan for CAFF. Greenland noted that CAFF appeared to be focusing more and more on research, rather than conservation strategies, outreach and education – CAFF should focus on conservation and only suggest research if it was needed to underpin specific conservation action. It was also noted that there needs to be a strong link to the Overview, as well as to the CAFF Strategic Plan.

Decision

- *CAFF agreed that the document going to Ministers for adoption should highlight thematic concerns of Arctic conservation, as well as identifying general ways and actions to address them.*
- *The document should not be limited to potential CAFF programs and projects, but identify all concerns of relevance to conservation.*
- *Countries will provide written comments on the draft (CAFF BMII-01/12-1) by September 14.*
- *Chair and Secretariat will develop a new draft based on comments received, as well as discussions at this meeting and send out to other WGs for comments by September 21.*
- *As a minimum an annotated outline of the document will be presented to the SAOs in November.*

13. Overview Report

➤ **Distribution and follow-up, including a website version (Secretariat)**

The Secretariat introduced a proposal (BMII-01/13-1) on mounting the overview document on the CAFF website, with options for users to download text and graphics in non-printable resolution.

Decision:

CAFF agreed to the proposal from the Secretariat (BMII-01/13-1)

14. Any Other Business

14.1 IUCN

The Secretariat introduced a request from IUCN to CAFF to assist them in preparing an IUCN Arctic Strategy, *inter alia* through identifying an obvious niche for IUCN's Arctic work.

Participants noted that there are already many actors implementing projects in the Arctic. A question was raised if IUCN intended to divert some of their global funds to Arctic work, or if they intended to compete with existing organisations for funds. Participants were of the opinion that IUCN could add most value in the Arctic by focusing on assisting with policy guidelines, conventions and legal work. Also, outreach and education was felt to be an area where IUCN could add value.

Decision:

- *CAFF Chair and Secretariat will prepare a draft letter to IUCN reflecting discussion at this meeting, inter alia recommending that IUCN focus on Key Result Area #2 (Agreements, processes and policies), and circulate to countries (by September 5) for quick return comments.*
- *Based on comments received, the Chair will decide if the letter will be sent out in CAFF's name or as a personal note from the Chair and Secretariat.*

14.2 GEO3

CAFF took note of the report prepared by Jan-Petter Huberth Hansen, Norway.

Decision:

- *The Secretariat will ensure that the next draft of the GEO3 Report is circulated to the CAFF Board for information.*

14.3 WWF Workshop on Fennoscandian Mountain Regions.

CAFF took note of the information provided by the Chair and welcomed his participation in this workshop

14.4. AC Capacity Building Workshop

CAFF took note of the information provided by the Chair and welcomed the invitation to him to chair a session focusing on CAFF.

15. Secretariat:

➤ Report and budget

The CAFF Board thanked Liubov Anissimova for her work for the CAFF Secretariat and wished her well in her new undertakings.

Decision:

- *The countries adopted the proposed Secretariat Budget for 2002 and agreed to continue providing the same financial support as in previous years.*
- *Countries agreed that eventual budget surplus in 2002 should be kept as a reserve and not earmarked for any purpose at this time.*

16. Next CAFF meetings

The next CAFF Board meeting was tentatively scheduled on April 10-11, 2002, in Iceland. Preparations continue for CAFF IX in Abisko, Sweden, in the last week of August (26-30), 2002. Exact dates will be decided later.

Appendix I:

CAFF BOARD MEETING, UPPSALA, AUGUST 29-30, 2001 –PARTICIPANTS LIST

Name	Institute	Address	Tel/Fax	E-mail
Baldursson, Snorri	CAFF	Hafnarstraeti 97 600 Akureyri Iceland	Tel: +354 462 3350 Fax: +354 462 3390	snorri@ni.is
Johan Hammar	Institute of Freshwater Research	SE-178 93 Drottningholm, Sweden	Tel: +46 8 620 04 24 Fax: +46 8 759 03 38	johan.hammar@fiskeriverket.se
Jaakkola, Esko	Ministry of the Environment	P.O. Box 380 FIN-00131 Helsinki Finland	Tel: +358 9 1991 9371 Fax: +358 9 1991 9364	esko.jaakkola@vyh.fi
Larsen, Thor	Agricultural University of Norway	P.O. Box 5001 N-1432 Aas, Norway	Tel: +47 649 499 50	thor.s.larsen@noragric.nlh.no
Lein, Berit	Directorate for Nature Management	Tungasletta 2 N 7485 Trondheim Norway	Tel: + 47 73 58 05 00 Fax: + 47 73 58 05 01	berit.lein@dirmat.no
Malmelin, Miliza	Ministry of Environment	P.O. Box 380 00131 Helsinki Finland	Tel: +358 9 1991 9740 Fax: +358 9 1991 9716	miliza.malmelin@vyh.fi
McCormick, Kevin	Environment Canada	5204 50th Avenue Suite 301 X1A 1E2 Yellowknife, NT Canada	Tel: + 1 867 669 4760 Fax: + 1 867 873 8185	kevin.mccormick@ec.gc.ca
Nielsen, Peter	Greenland Homerule, Department of Environment and Nature	P.O. Box 1614 DK 3900 Nuuk Greenland	Tel: + 299 34 67 15 Fax: + 299 32 52 86	PEN@gh.gl
Petersen, Aevar	Icelandic Institute of Natural History	P.O. Box 5320 125 Reykjavik Iceland	Tel: + 354 562 9822 Fax: + 354 562 0815	aevar@ni.is

Pishchelev, Vladimir	Ministry of Natural Resources Protection and Ecological Security	8-1, Kedrova Street 117874 Moscow Russia	Tel: + 7 095 124 0471 Fax: + 7 095 125 5209	zapchin@glas.org
Prestrud, Pål	Norwegian Polar Institute	Polar Environmental Centre, N-9296 Tromsø, Norway	Tel: + 47 77 75 05 00, Fax: + 47 77 75 05 01	pal.prestrud@npolar.no
Retter, Gunn-Britt	Indigenous Peoples Secretariat (IPS)	P.O. Box 2151, Pilestræde 52 DK-1016 Copenhagen K Denmark	Tel: +45 33 69 34 98 Fax: +45 33 69 34 99	ghs@ghsdk.dk
Smith, Duane	Inuvialuit Game Council (ICC)	P.O. Box 2120 X0E 0T0 Inuvik, NT Canada	Tel: +867 777 2828 Fax: +867 777 2616	IOC-C@jointsec.nt.ca
Sohlberg, Sune	Swedish Environmental Protection Agency Natural	Resources Department Blekholmserrassen 36 S-106 48 Stockholm Sweden	Tel : + 46 8 698 13 36 Fax: + 46 8 698 10 42	sune.sohlberg@environ.se
Sulyandziga, Pavel	RAIPON	Prospect Vernadskogo 37 Jorpus 2, Kom. 527 117425 Moscow Russia	Tel: +7 095 930 7197 Fax: +7 095 930 4468	udege@glasnet.ru
Zöckler, Christoph	World Conservation Monitoring Center	219 Huntington Road CB3 0DL Cambridge UK	Tel: + 44 1223 277 314 Fax: + 44 1223 277 136	cristoph.zoeckler@wcmc.org.uk
Wohl, Kent	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	1011 East Tudor Road 99053 Anchorage, Alaska USA	Tel: + 1 907 786 3503 Fax: + 1 907 786 3641	Kent_Wohl@mail.fws.gov
Åkesson, Christina	Embassy of the United States of America, Stockholm, Sweden	Dag Hammarskjölds Väg 31, SE-115 89 Stockholm Sweden	Tel: +46 8 783 53 00 Fax: +46 8 661 19 64	

Appendix II

CAFF Board Meeting, Uppsala, August 29-30, 2001

Venue and accommodation: Hotel Linné, Skolgatan 45,
tel +46 18 10 20 00, fax +46 18 13 75 97

Revised Draft Agenda

- 2. Introduction and adoption of the Agenda (Chair)**
- 3. Adoption of Report from CAFF Board Meeting in April (Chair)**
- 4. Review of management since April**
 - Report from Rovaniemi anniversary
 - Report from SAO-meeting
- 5. Pekka Havisto's report on restructuring of the Arctic Council**
- 6. CPAN**
 - Report from the CPAN Standing Committee (USA)
 - Recommendations for actions in the marine environment based on discussion paper from the *ad hoc* CPAN marine group (Canada)
 - Discussion paper on Full Value of Arctic Protected Areas (Canada)
 - Interim report on the Sacred Sites project (RAIPON)
- 7. Biodiversity monitoring**
 - CAFF position paper (Iceland)
 - Status of networks (Iceland)
 - Discussion on how to organise the biodiversity monitoring work
- 8. Arctic Climate Impact Assessment**
 - Status report/update (Norway)
- 9. GEF**
 - Status report/update (Norway)
 - Funding and next steps (All)
- 10. Circumpolar Seabird Working Group:**
 - Status report/update (USA)
 - Migratory Bird Workshop Report recommendations (USA)
- 11. CAFF Flora Group**
 - First meeting report and recommendations (USA)

12. Coordination with other AC and Northern activities:

- AMAP – CAFF - AMAP joint meeting, coordination, ACIA
- PAME – CAFF-PAME collaboration on marine conservation
- SDWG – projects on sustainable use of living resources

13. Recommendations based on the CAFF Overview Report

- The Chair will introduce an outline of recommendations, based on the CAFF overview report and other ongoing work of CAFF (Chair)

14. Overview Report

- Distribution and follow-up, including a website version (Secretariat)

15. Any Other Business

16. Review of Record of Decisions

Closed meeting of CAFF National Representatives

17. Secretariat:

- Budget and report (Chair/Executive Secretary)

Draft Timeline

August 29

10:00 – 12:00. Items 1-4

13:30 – 17:30. Items 5-9

19:00 – Invited dinner

August 30

09:00 – 12:00. Items 10-12

13:30 – 16:00. Items 12-15

16:00 – 17:30. Item 16

Appendix III

General outline of the early costs of Network Co-ordination and the Initiation of a Monitoring Program:

1. *Financial support of an annual part-time work with the co-ordination of a CAFF indicator Monitoring Network, and standard data processing.*

In order to fulfil the obligations of a network co-ordination to CAFF, and the participants of the network, an annual part-time engagement of 1-2 man-months is required. This will allow the co-ordinator to stimulate, support, adjust, control and compile annual information on accomplishments and/or national contributions of data sets, etc.

2. *Participation at the level of consulting author in the production of a multi-authored book in Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA)*

The task as a consulting author of the ACIA report is estimated to involve up to 1 month per year during a 3-4 years period.

3. *Organisation and hosting of an initial, international workshop in collaboration with CAFF and/or AMAP in order to identify, harmonise and initiate the sampling programs of a circumpolar monitoring network on an indicator species.*

In order to commence a circumpolar monitoring program on an indicator species it is vital to meet and identify, harmonise and agree on geographic locations, basic methods and sampling procedures. The organisation and hosting of such an initial workshop for the members of the network require 1 man-month's salary including travelling costs, and a subsidised 4-5 day stay at preferably northern research station for ca 25 members, during early year 2002.

4. *Organization and hosting of an international follow-up workshop in collaboration with CAFF and/or AMAP in order to basically adjust key sampling programs and if possibly also evaluate early indicators and trends in successful monitoring programs on the indicator species.*

A subsidised follow-up workshop on a circumpolar monitoring program on an indicator species is suggested during spring 2004 after an active monitoring period of 2 summers. Also the organisation and hosting of such a summarising workshop require 1 man-month's salary including travelling costs, and a subsidised 6-7 day stay at preferably a northern research station for ca 25 members.

5. *Initiation of a national monitoring program on the indicator species with repeated sampling of environmental, ecological and genetic parameters from a few selected populations.*

A national monitoring program should include at least three, preferably six populations, in habitats with temperature loggers, located north of the Polar Circle, sampled and extensively analysed for a series of ecological and genetic parameters every third year. This would require 5 man-month's salary, including fieldwork, helicopter-transports, temperature loggers, sampling equipment, and the processing of individual tissue and other data samples. After an initial 3-years survey, the monitored populations should be included in the national environmental probation program.

	1	2	3	4	5
2002	2mo	1mo	1mo		5mo
2003	2mo	1mo			5mo
2004	2mo	1mo		1mo	5mo
etc.					