

To: CAFF Working Group

From: Magdalena AK Muir, CAFF Secretariat and Kent Wohl, Chair, CAFF

Date: May 20, 2003

Re: Final report for the CAFF Management Board Meeting on March 11 to 13, 2003, in Girdwood, Alaska

Please find attached the final report of the CAFF Management Board meeting in Girdwood, Alaska on March 11 to 13, 2003

Regards

Kent and Magdalena

**Final Report of CAFF Management Board Meeting,
March 11 to 13, 2003, Girdwood, Alaska**

1. Welcome by Chair and Introduction.

Welcome by Kent Wohl, Chair, CAFF, to Alaska. Round table introductions by those present. All national representatives were present except Greenland and Russia.

2. Adoption of agenda.

Following approval of minor changes, the agenda was approved.

3. Adoption of minutes of recent meetings.

a) Adoption of CAFF minutes from Management Board meeting, Abisko, August 27 and 30, 2002

Minutes were requested from CAFF Management Board meetings within a short time frame. The Board agreed that the minutes would include activities and a decision statement. The minutes will also include an update of the work plan and CAFF budget, and a one page summary of allocation of time within the Secretariat. The Management Board is interested in knowing commitments of the CAFF Secretariat. At this time, there was a discussion of monthly reporting by the CAFF Secretariat, as specified in the reconvened Management Board meeting on August 30, 2003. Further discussion of reporting by the CAFF Secretariat is provided under agenda items # 4 and 15.

Action Item:

The CAFF Chair and Secretariat will produce a revised format per this discussion for Board meeting minutes.

b) Adoption of CAFF IX minutes, Abisko, August 28 to 30, 2002.

It was decided to revise the passage concerning the Netherlands; and the report to the SAOs. Some changes are required to the discussion of the arctic vegetation map, which will be the first map in a CAFF Map series. There was discussion as to the need to be clear when decisions are made, and certainty for lead responsibility for action items. The minutes should be a record of decisions. Decisions from CAFF IX are also reflected in the CAFF Work Plan 2002-2004.

Action Item:

The Chair and CAFF Secretariat will circulate another version of CAFF IX minutes for Thursday morning. A final draft version will be provided shortly.

4. Update on activities of CAFF since last meeting.

There was a discussion of the activities of the different CAFF working groups, and deliverables of CAFF for the Ministerial meeting in 2004. There was a discussion of cooperation with other AC Working Groups including PAME for the Arctic Marine Strategy, cooperation with AMAP for monitoring and the ACIA Policy Document, and cooperation with SDWG on various initiatives.

It was agreed that it would be useful to see work plans of the SDWG and other AC Working Groups, as it was important to know what these groups are doing, to identify specific areas where cooperation should focus, and the role of CAFF Management Board in this cooperation. This could be a role for the CAFF Secretariat. It would be useful to have a matrix to identify possible areas of mutual interest. There was a discussion of the greater role of the Management Board in attending meetings to assist the CAFF Secretariat.

There was a discussion of different areas where CAFF has been active, including meetings with different Working Groups, Observers to CAFF, and other parties. There was a discussion of the role of the UK and Netherlands in CAFF activities. There was discussion of participation of CAFF in the Northern Forum meeting in St Petersburg, and why this meeting may be of value to CAFF for the implementation of the ECORA project and other CAFF initiatives. The value of monthly reporting by the CAFF Secretariat, and advance notice of meetings was also stressed.

There was a discussion of the issue of funding for AC activities, and the need for greater involvement of the AC, particularly with respect to the European Union. The Chair of the AC is interested in facilitating fund raising efforts. There was a discussion of the usefulness of AC funding efforts for projects such as the Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program. There was also a discussion of the potential value to CAFF's fund raising efforts of an "Arctic Council endorsement." The issue of the complexity and availability of funding from EU and other entities was raised, but CAFF will also need to focus its funding efforts. A potential funding opportunity for CAFF was raised, particularly in relation to the cross-cutting issues and requirements arising from contaminants monitoring and the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment.

5. Circumpolar Protected Areas Network (CPAN) Activities.

a) Country updates on recent protected area establishment, management and legislative initiatives.

Canada is leading this initiative, which will be completed by the end of 2003. It will be necessary to decide whether this report should be published as a CAFF Technical Report.

Action Item:

Draft country report due in September 2003 to Jim Johnston, CPAN. This report will be revised and completed by the end of 2003. A decision to make this document a CAFF Technical Report is required for the next board meeting.

b) Workshop on protecting large un-fragmented areas from September 8 to 11, 2003 in Yellowknife.

At this time, this workshop has a Canadian focus, and there is the need to discuss how best to expand this workshop to include a circumpolar perspective. There was a discussion about scheduling of different meetings for marine and terrestrial issues, including whether the workshop on protecting large un-fragmented areas could be followed by a workshop on the compendium of ecologically important marine areas. The CPAN may also meet in November or December 2003 in combination with other workshops.

Action Item:

It was decided to remand this matter back to the CPAN Co-Chairs, so that they can consider and resolve dates for different workshops and meetings. Potentially related workshops are those for protecting un-fragmented areas in September 2003, the marine compendium workshop that will

occur sometime in the fall 2003, the proposed AC workshop on arctic marine strategies in October 2003, and the CPAN meeting in November or December 2003.

c) Workshop on Compendium of Ecologically Important Marine Areas.

The proposed workshop will be the first step in addressing this matter. There was also a discussion of whether advance preparation may be required for the workshop, particularly if data sets are required.

Action Item:

US to follow through with CPAN Co-Chairs about requirements and scheduling for the workshop, with further information to be provided through CPAN group and national representatives.

d) Analysis of regional and international agreements and evaluate their potential to contribute to CAFF's protected areas initiatives.

The activities begin in April with US parties being contacted in order to develop agreement on the criteria for analysis. Sometime by the end of 2003 or early in 2004, a draft will be forwarded. The scope and ambit of report has not yet been finalized. There may be a background document, and subsequently a clear concise analytical document. It has not been decided if a Technical Report will be the outcome from this work. The IUCN has been doing work in this area, and this may be an area of cooperation. The issue of the Nordic Council and funding support was also identified.

Action Item:

Finland to follow through on this matter and report back to the CAFF Management Board.

e) Sacred Sites Report.

The report was printed in a draft form, but it is still necessary to finalize treatment of the recommendations and the format of the final report. There is no discussion or framework yet for the workshop, and it will be necessary to raise funding for the workshop. CAFF has been supporting RAIPON's efforts in this regard. In CAFF's view, this is a very important report, and a good example of capacity building. Russia and RAIPON are leads on this project. Given their absence, there will be an information inquiry by CAFF Secretariat on the circumpolar workshop. Interest in the workshop was also indicated by the CPAN; the Indigenous Peoples Secretariat; and the Aleut International Association, and it was noted that the workshop may also be of interest to Denmark and Netherlands.

Action Item:

This is a Russian and RAIPON lead, but there will be follow through and inquiry by the CAFF Secretariat.

f) Brochure and poster based on CAFF publication for Protected Areas of the Arctic-Conserving a Full Range of Values.

There was a discussion of the costs in relation to a poster display for Protected Areas of the Arctic. This poster will build on Canada's contribution to the brochure, and efforts of the CPAN. This matter will be discussed subsequently as part of an allocation of the CAFF budget, but there was an indication of the general support of the Management Board for this poster display. The issue was also raised of assistance with confirming Russian participation for the Parks Congress, and the CAFF Chair agreed to assist CPAN in this regard.

Action Item:

There was support for the creation of a poster display, with the discussion of the costs of this display being deferred to a discussion of CAFF Budget.

6. Circumpolar Seabird Group (CBIRD).

a) Report on seabird gillnet bycatch initiatives.

Discussion of seabird gillnet bycatch initiatives.

Action Item:

US will provide a Technical Report by 2004. Prior to 2004, the national representatives are to follow through to ensure country reports are completed. US will provide a report outline for country authors.

b) CAFF Technical Report No. 5, Seabird Harvest Regimes in Circumpolar Nations.

There was no need to update this technical report at this time, so there will not be a new report.

Action item:

CBIRD will summarize information on the seabird harvest regimes in issues of the Circumpolar Seabird Bulletin.

c) Circumpolar Eider Conservation Strategy and Action Plan.

Generally, there is good progress on action items in the action plan. One new item is completing a Common Eider Colony Map; Canada is taking the lead role. Sweden offered its assistance for the Common Eider Colony Map, including an extension into Baltic area. The issue was raised of the status of eiders in Alaska, and the apparent decline in this population. It was suggested it is necessary to review Eider Strategy to see what has been completed, and what is required for the future.

Another issue is the breeding and harvesting of eiders between Canada and Greenland. This issue may be facilitated by participation of indigenous organizations and the Permanent Participants, and may be best addressed by different hunting organizations. There was a discussion of co-management initiatives in Alaska between indigenous peoples, scientists and managers, particularly for migratory birds. ICC-Greenland has been discussing the issue with local hunters, and including other issues such as "lead shot."

Action Item:

There is ongoing work for the completion of the Common Eider Colony Map for CBIRD X in early 2004. Canada is taking a lead role with respect to the map, and for the review of the Eider Conservation Strategy. There will be ongoing involvement of Permanent Participants, given the indicated interest during discussions.

d) International Murre Conservation Strategy and Action Plan.

National follow-ups are occurring for the murre conservation strategy and action plan. Last year, Canada led a summary of murre populations, which resulted in the creation of a murre poster. Development of a murre monitoring plan has been led by the US. A murre banding plan has been led by Iceland and Norway. A murre climate change paper is being developed. The paper is being led by the US, with cooperation of all countries, and will lead to publication in a peer-

reviewed journal. Other efforts are underway with murre populations and migratory patterns and band recovery analyses, with intent that further papers be submitted for peer-reviewed journals. Lastly, there has been circumpolar murre colony data and mapping, with further information being posted on the CAFF web page.

There was a discussion of the CAFF map series, and including murre colony map in this series. There was also a discussion of the importance of these species and the arctic marine strategy.

Action Items:

There are various deadlines over next two years, as described in the CAFF Work Plan.

e) Framework for Circumpolar Seabird Monitoring Network.

The main issues are: the identification of what will be defined as arctic seabirds, current international and national programs, circumpolar relevance, arctic responsibility for a species, distribution, AMAP-species, economic importance, most imminent threats (oil, hunting, bycatch, or climate change), relevance as environmental indicators, scientific and cultural importance, and different trophic levels and their ecological importance. No priority list has been developed yet, but a matrix will be developed among members of CBIRD. The value of including the concerns and knowledge of indigenous peoples was raised.

Action Item:

This is an ongoing initiative for the CBIRD Group. The draft plan for the network should be available in 2003, and endorsed by the CBIRD Group by 2004. It could also be part of the Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program, which will be eventually endorsed by CAFF.

f) Status and trends of seabirds.

This project will be better defined at the next seabird meeting in January or February 2004. At this point, it is necessary to determine the number of species, and level of detail. At this time, it is a general compilation, versus a scientific or technical report.

Action Item:

Completion of information and report for next CBIRD meeting is led by Iceland.

7. Circumpolar Flora Group (CFG).

a) Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Map.

There was a discussion by the Chair of the CFG concerning the recent draft of the Circumpolar Arctic Vegetation Map. A concern was raised by Iceland about representation of this country on the map. A concern was raised by the Aleut International Association that the Commander Islands was excluded from this map and from other CAFF maps, and that this concern needs to be addressed for any future maps.

Action Item:

The map will be going to the printer by April 2003, and delivered subsequently. Upon completion, an electronic version of the map will be posted on the CAFF website.

b) Checklist of arctic lichens and bryophytes.

A checklist has begun for arctic lichens. A checklist has not yet been initiated for bryophytes.

Action Item:

May 20, 2003

This issue will be updated at the next meeting of the CFG.

c) PanArctic Flora Checklist, and initiate revised Atlas of Rare Vascular Plants of the Arctic.

The PanArctic Flora checklist is ongoing. A revision of the Atlas will be initiated sometime in the future.

Action Item:

This issue will be addressed at the next meeting of the CFG.

d) Report on monitoring local flora (presence and abundance) in Russia.

Action Item:

This item will be updated at the next meeting of the CFG.

e) International Workshop on Classification of Arctic Vegetation.

Action Item:

There is the requirement to prepare a statement of work for a workshop, which will be hosted in Greenland, subject to availability of funding. There will be further discussion and reporting from the next meeting of the Flora Group.

f) Process to gather and incorporate traditional knowledge for use and conservation of arctic plants.

The Chair, CFG, placed an initial inquiry for bibliographic citations of the National Representatives. The Aleut International Association indicated there was an individual who may be interested in these matters on the Commander Islands and raised the possibility of funding for their attendance. Others are also interested in this area, and asked to be updated as matters progressed. Concern was raised about the ownership of traditional knowledge and how it is used. The National Representatives indicated that CAFF welcomed the involvement of the Permanent Participants in this issue.

Action Item:

The National Representatives will provide citations to the CFG Chair by April 10, 2003. The Aleut International Association and the Gwich'in Council International are to follow through with inquiries to Stephen Talbot. Aleut International Association will lead on this matter. Further discussions will occur on this matter at the CFG meeting in April.

g) CFG Meeting.

The CFG is meeting in Helsinki, Finland from April 28 to 30, 2003. No final agenda is available. There was potential discussion between the Aleutian International Association and the CFG Chair about attendance of a Russian specialist at this meeting to address the gathering and incorporation of traditional knowledge for the use and conservation of arctic plants.

The CAFF Management Board indicated it is necessary to focus more on conservation and biodiversity of flora in relation to activities of CFG; and a desire to see a strategic approach to conservation of arctic flora and vegetation. There was a discussion of the identification of conservation concerns and challenges that are facing arctic flora. There was also a discussion of what is reasonably deliverable by the CFG. There was reference to the EU strategy and the work
May 20, 2003

of botanists under that strategy, and reference to the CAFF Overview Report and recommendations as a possible framework. There was discussion of the issue of the uniqueness of certain plants, and need to record and map them.

Action Item:

The CAFF Management Board requested the CFG to prepare a short discussion paper on the identification of concerns and key conservation challenges for arctic flora and vegetation. There is a request for the completion of a paper for the spring of 2004, with an interim outline for the next CAFF Management Board meeting in the fall of 2003. Note: There was a general request from CAFF Management Board for the CFG to clarify the time frames for this work plan item and other plan items.

8. Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Project (CBMP).

There was a discussion of the progress report for the CBMP, fund raising efforts for this project, and the distribution of status reports that were provided over last few months to the networks of experts and CAFF support group for the project. There was the completion of a more detailed monitoring project report, and discussion of different meetings and activities. This includes Scannet, UK, IASC, and TESEO. There is a high level of interest in this project. It is currently focused on developing the framework. Specific outcomes for the near future include community-based monitoring and the need to involve IPS and Permanent Participants; and the compilation of meta-analysis of monitoring programs. AMAP has offered the use of a web-based data directory, and CAFF has accepted its offer. There was also discussion about the use of a web-based GIS approach, which could be developed by WCMC. WCMC is willing to work cooperatively with CAFF to seek funding. There was a discussion of the eight different networks that are in place, the role of coordinators, and the need to provide finding support.

Suggested action items include publishing minutes of the CAFF biodiversity monitoring meeting as a technical report, and considering the role of Observer Countries and Organizations. It was recognized that it was important to get reports and suggestions from networks of experts, which is the responsibility of Iceland as the lead country on this issue. Fund raising efforts are continuing on a circumpolar, European and North American basis. There is a need to develop a framework for the circumpolar biodiversity monitoring program. Other matters could be a review of results from the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), with the aim of identifying monitoring needs and opportunities. There is the possibility of posting information on the CAFF web page. It also might be useful to explore links with AMAP, and needs identified in ACIA Scientific Report and Policy Recommendations. In order to proceed, it is necessary to have the involvement and support of CAFF. The relevance of efforts for circumpolar seabird monitoring efforts was stressed as a demonstration of what is possible.

Two handouts were provided: a status report for March 2003, and the other a draft framework document, Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Program: Objectives, Structure and Principal Components. There was a discussion of who is the audience for the framework document, and consensus that at a minimum it is the Ministers. It should also be useful and attractive for other partners, including AC countries, collaborators, partners and funders. The general strategy is contained in the framework document. The CBMP is meant to integrate arctic biodiversity monitoring and research across three distinct levels: species, sites and ecosystems. There was a discussion of simplifying the message. A brief 3-5 page framework document was suggested consisting of: background, goals and objectives, implementing strategy, and next steps.

The implementation of the CBMP was discussed, including the idea of countries adopting a network. There was the idea of shared monitoring efforts with AMAP; and monitoring to meet recommendations and obligations under the ACIA. There was the observation that monitoring for climate change may be one of the less contentious recommendations in the ACIA Policy Document. There was also the discussion about countries meeting obligations under the Convention for Biological Diversity through national monitoring programs, and the need to coordinate national approaches, as opposed to replacing or supplanting national programs. Certain species may also be interesting for certain countries, such as arctic char in Sweden. However, it was stressed the CBMP is not limited to threatened species. There will be follow through by the US to discuss the CBMP with the National Science Foundation, long term monitoring programs in the US, and need to ensure congruency.

There was also a discussion of the coordinated monitoring program and AMAP. One aspect could be sharing the same sites for contaminants and biodiversity monitoring. The product could be a description of two monitoring systems. A shared area for CAFF and AMAP could be monitoring for climatic purposes, noting that AMAP is quite interested in monitoring for climatic purposes.

Action Item:

It was decided that there would be a meeting between CAFF and AMAP in Reykjavik during the SAO meeting in April 2003 to discuss overlaps with monitoring approaches. Iceland and the CAFF Chair are to ensure that a brief framework document is available for this meeting. There is also a funded workshop for the shorebird group to address monitoring issues this fall.

9. CAFF ECORA Project.

a) Project documentation, process and schedule.

Norway led this discussion. The Russian Federation, CAFF and Grid-Arendal initiated the project in 1999. It was planned to implement Russia's obligation to CAFF and the Convention of Biological Diversity. There was a discussion of the three different model areas, and the necessary involvement of other CAFF countries to provide guidance and financial support for these areas. Reports have occurred from the PDF-A and B phases which may be published as CAFF Technical Reports. Project financing, including Russian cash and in-kind funding and levels of taxation were summarized.

The latest reports are from March 6, 2003. UNDP is pursuing an agreement with UNDP-Russia concerning money management. It is not clear where the Plan Implementation Unit will be physically housed. No concrete date for meeting on ECORA in Arendal is scheduled yet, though it may occur as early as April. The internalization of draft documents for the ECORA Project has been initiated. Norway will provide details as to the scheduling of meetings for documentation. There was a discussion as to reporting to the SAO meeting on ECORA in April 2003, though much will depend on steps that UNEP-Grid Arendal takes next.

There was a brief discussion of the role of the CAFF Secretariat in developing the project in PDF-A and B stage, and continuing role of CAFF countries in implementation of the project at a later stage. There is also the need to consider the available time of the CAFF Secretariat. There was also a discussion of the involvement of Arctic Council and AC countries in the project.

There were questions as to allocation of GEF money and decisions which will be made in the
May 20, 2003

Steering Committee, in part through descriptions provided in the PDF-B documents. There was the issue of local involvement and building consensus for different model areas, with these decisions then flowing up to more senior levels. There was some question as to whether projects can begin in 2003. For the western arctic model area, the Nordic countries already have a sense of those whom they wish to work with and contacts, as well as historic involvement in this area. This situation is not anticipated for the other two model areas.

b) CAFF Secretariat's Role in Implementation.

The CAFF Secretariat led a discussion about the role of CAFF participation in the ECORA project. CAFF is represented on the Steering Committee through the participation of Norway. There was also the prior involvement of the CAFF Secretariat in the drafting of the PDF-B proposals.

Some thoughts were expressed by the CAFF Secretariat on the continuing involvement of CAFF and CAFF Secretariat in the implementation of ECORA. Tiina Kurvits is now functioning as coordinator for Grid-Arendal for the project, and there has been ongoing discussion with Grid-Arendal as to how involvement of CAFF and CAFF Secretariat could occur in practice. Some potential thoughts from CAFF Secretariat about that participation:

- Facilitating the participation of CAFF National Representatives, Permanent Participants, and Observers.
- Involving CPAN and CBIRD Groups in relevant aspects of ECORA
- Providing technical expertise.
- Adopting different model areas by CAFF countries. The absence of designated countries right now may require a more active role for the Secretariat in the central model area within the Sahka Republic, as there is a greater involvement of Nordic countries, and US and Canada, respectively, in the western and eastern model areas.
- The publications of different reports from PDF-A and B phases of projects.

There was a discussion as to the role of the CAFF Secretariat to meet the needs of the CAFF Management Board for this project. There was the view from some parties that CAFF needs to be associated with all aspects of this project. There was another view that there is a difference between information requirements, and the technical involvement of the CAFF Secretariat in the implementation of ECORA. The issue was raised of having Grid-Arendal and the CAFF Secretariat work together to develop a proposal the role of CAFF and the CAFF Secretariat. The issue was raised of the involvement of CAFF countries, and it was suggested that facilitating this involvement could be an appropriate role for the CAFF Secretariat, in addition to any information requirements and reporting.

Action Items:

Norway is to report back to the CAFF Management Board on the documentation process, will request Grid-Arendal to provide monthly status reports, and request the CAFF Secretariat to get back and clarify with respect to the printing of two ECORA reports as CAFF Technical Reports.

The CAFF Secretariat and Grid-Arendal will develop a proposal for involving CAFF and CAFF Secretariat in the ECORA project.

10. Birds of Arctic Conservation Concern

This is a new project, and involves a large percentage of arctic bird species. The project is based on earlier workshops, and was fully discussed at the CBIRD meeting in Tromsø. The US is taking the lead on this project, with a framework being circulated shortly, and publications shortly after the CBIRD meeting in January or February 2004. The purpose of the report is to document arctic birds of concern, and, improve protection of arctic birds when they are outside the jurisdiction of the arctic countries.

There was a discussion about the format of the report. There was a discussion as to the criteria for inclusion of species: i.e., outside of country or outside of the arctic. There were issues of consistency of reporting, or allowing countries to define their "species of concern. Another descriptive title was suggested - Arctic breeding migratory birds of conservation concern - as it allows consideration of birds that utilize international waters, which are relevant for Alaskan and Russian populations, but that don't necessarily leave the arctic. The definition of "birds of arctic conservation concern" was discussed, particularly whether it was intended to include the complete territory of the Nordic countries, Canada, and Russia. It was determined that birds that reside wholly within the jurisdiction of a country would not be considered, as that is a domestic matter. It was also determined that individual countries should have the discretion to define the boundaries for these birds, and whether to include all or a portion of their territory. Last, the report should make generous use of maps and photos to make the report more attractive to non-specialists.

Action Item:

The report will be a deliverable for the Ministerial meeting in 2004. CAFF National Representatives to come back with contact persons for their national contribution. The US is to provide further descriptive information.

11. Arctic Climate Change Impact Assessment.

a) Scientific Report.

There was a summary and discussion of the ACIA Scientific Report, with the most recent second version being just released. Parties were thanked for their nominations to the review process.

b) Policy Document.

The CAFF Chair provided a summary. Detail was provided on the nominees for the ACIA process for countries and Permanent Participants, and the tentative schedule for deadlines for drafts and meetings. There will be separation between science authors and the policy drafting team, though there will be a close link between the scientific report and policy recommendations. There will be many opportunities for consultation on subsequent drafts by the different working groups, and by the CAFF Management Board. There was a discussion of how CAFF national representatives work through nominated policy team members. No action items at this time.

12. CAFF Report for SAO Meeting, April 9 and 10, 2003.

The CAFF Secretariat introduced the draft SAO report for April 2003. There was a range of comments on this matter, including that it would be useful to insert updates and closure on different work plan items.

Action Item:

Focus for presentation at the SAO Meeting will be on the CBMP issue, with reference to draft framework document and ACIA Policy Document.

13. AC Arctic Marine Strategy, as facilitated by PAME.

Sweden discussed their attendance at the PAME meeting in Stockholm in February 2003 on the arctic marine strategy. There was a discussion about the meeting. With respect to the upcoming workshop, the process will be very open, and a draft marine strategy will be determined after that workshop.

The CAFF Management then had an overall discussion about the arctic marine strategy, and the process that was being coordinated by PAME. Strong concerns were expressed that the process for the arctic marine strategy must involve all AC working groups as equal players and be collaborative, as opposed to a process that is pre-determined by PAME. There were also strong concerns expressed that the current documentation and discussion papers issued by PAME were sparse, and do not adequately address biodiversity and conservation. There were comments on the draft agenda, which has a very restricted role for biodiversity and conservation issues. There was a discussion of time frame for CAFF participation, and the commitments that can be made by CAFF's internal groups. Finally, there were comments with respect to the timing of receiving notice of the strategy from the CAFF Secretariat.

The key question addressed by the CAFF Management Board was the future involvement and contributions of CAFF. It was recognized that it is important that CAFF participate in this strategy.

Action Item:

There was a consensus that CAFF will participate in this process: with the development of agenda, participation in the workshop, and the drafting of materials. Meetings on this matter will be scheduled between the CAFF and PAME Secretariats. There will also be an additional discussion during the meeting of Chairs of the AC working groups at the SAO meeting. At that time, there will be the need to clarify that this is a collaborative project of all AC working groups.

14. New issue: Incorporation of traditional knowledge for biodiversity and conservation.

This is a new topic introduced by Gwich'in Council International (GCI). The topic is the incorporation of traditional knowledge in biodiversity and conservation activities. GCI is interested in the topic of traditional knowledge, and willing to take a lead role in addressing and developing this proposal in conjunction with IPS. This topic could potentially have relevance and importance to other CAFF projects such as the Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Project.

Action Item:

Gwich'in Council International will follow through with Indigenous Peoples Secretariat and consider developing a proposal, which will then be submitted to the CAFF Management Board.

15. CAFF Secretariat -Reporting, Workplan and Budgets.

a) CAFF Secretariat Reporting.

There was a discussion of reporting by the CAFF Secretariat, both on a monthly basis, and in terms of projected allocation of time (i.e., the CAFF Secretariat Work Plan) for 2003. The CAFF Management Board stressed the importance of timely monthly and prospective reporting to understand the involvement and activities of the CAFF Secretariat. Reporting was identified as a key priority for the CAFF Secretariat, and a responsibility for which time should be allocated. One aspect of this reporting was to ensure that CAFF Secretariat was not over-committed, and, if so, to ensure that additional resources can be sought or provided.

Action Item:

The Secretariat should provide a monthly status report documenting allocation of time, meetings, travel schedule, and project involvement. A first draft of this schedule will be drafted by the CAFF Chair and Secretariat and provided to the CAFF Working Group for March 21, 2003.

b) CAFF Secretariat Work Plan.

There was a discussion of the draft work plan prepared by the CAFF Secretariat and Chair. The view was expressed that this work plan was not sufficiently detailed. A request was made for the CAFF Secretariat and Chair to provide a more detailed work plan for circulation to the CAFF Working Group. Certain parties offered to subsequently provide spreadsheets for that work plan.

Action Item:

The CAFF Secretariat will provide a detailed work plan, which may subsequently also be placed in a spreadsheet. The next version of this work plan will be drafted by the CAFF Chair and Secretariat and provided to the CAFF Working Group for March 21, 2003.

c) 2002 and 2003 Budgets of CAFF Secretariat.

There was an introduction and description of the CAFF budget by the CAFF Secretariat. There was a review of the level of different expenditures within the accrued 2002 budget, and estimated budget for 2003. There was some discussion as to the budget allocated for domestic and international travel, and a request for further clarification. There was also a discussion of budgets allocated for special projects for 2003. Finally, CPAN requested moneys for a poster display for the World Parks Congress. There was a discussion and approval for the CPAN poster presentation. Canada will go back to CPAN, and clarify actual costs for presentation.

In the earlier stages of the ECORA Project, the CAFF Secretariat was involved in preparing project proposals and papers. There was the observation that it may be necessary to shift from the contribution of the CAFF Secretariat, and instead focus on the involvement by CAFF countries in the next stage of implementation. In the next stage of implementation, Norway, as a result of its role on the steering committee for the project, and the CAFF Secretariat may also need further support. It was observed that CAFF countries will need to be involved in the ECORA Project through matching funds and staff. It was determined that the CAFF Secretariat should identify different roles in implementation by CAFF and the CAFF Secretariat, and related budgets for the CAFF Secretariat.

Action Item:

CAFF Secretariat and Grid-Arendal are to identify different approaches for the ECORA Project, and related budgets for these approaches. A revised budget is to be forwarded to the CAFF Board to reflect different approaches for the ECORA Project. This revised budget will also reflect CPAN expenses for the display presentation at the World Parks Congress, and other commitments.

16. Discussion of participation of Permanent Participants in ACIA Policy Document.

The Permanent Participants requested the support of CAFF for their participation in the ACIA Policy Document. There was a discussion of how involvement of the Permanent Participants could be funded and the funding necessary to ensure that participation. It was noted that CAFF has been approached in the past by the Indigenous Peoples Secretariat and the Permanent Participants about supporting applications to SAOs for funding for that participation. The CAFF Chair agreed to raise participation of Permanent Participants at the meeting of AC Working Group Chairs and to initiate and support application of Permanent Participation for funding at SAO meeting.

Action Item:

The CAFF Chair agreed to raise participation of Permanent Participants at the meeting of AC Working Group Chairs, and to initiate and support application of Permanent Participation for funding at the SAO meeting.

17. Cooperation of CAFF with other bodies.

There was a general discussion of the areas in which the different working groups cooperate. EPPR and PAME have different maps that are of concern to CAFF. For PAME, there is the "sea sensitivities map." For EPPR, there is a "resources at risk map." There was a discussion of cooperation with SDWG and CAFF with respect to traditional knowledge project, and another proposal that may be initiated by Gwich'in Council International. Canada mentioned that members of the SDWG are quite interested in ECORA, and would perhaps use CAFF participation in the SDWG meeting as an opportunity to inform and invite participation in ECORA. It was also raised that it might be useful to request CPAN and CBIRD to examine both PAME and EPPR maps to determine their relevance to CAFF.

There was a discussion as to the role of Observers in CAFF, and vice versa. There was a discussion of the role of UK and Netherlands, academically, scientifically and governmentally. There was also a discussion of the role of WCMC, and their offer to seek GIS funding in cooperation with CAFF to create a GIS platform for the CBMP, and reference to CAFF collaborating with IPS in raising funding for community-based monitoring aspects of CBMP.

The issue was raised of whether it would be useful for CAFF to participate in meeting of IPS and the Permanent Participants. There is an April 6 meeting of Permanent Participants, prior to the SAO meetings, and the IPS representative will check about availability or opportunity to meet at that time, or in relation to the SAO meeting.

Aleut International Association raised the idea of bringing aspects and concepts of the Sacred Sites report to other regions of the Arctic, and specifically Alaska. There was also a discussion of the participation of Alaska Permanent Participants in the circumpolar workshop for Sacred Sites. The issue of traditional knowledge, and its relation to arctic vegetation was also raised. Another

issue was participation of Permanent Participants in the ECORA project, perhaps in relation to in-kind contributions and capacity building between US and Canada, and implementation of ecosystem approaches and capacity building for the model areas.

There was a brief report in relation to IUCN, including possible links to the ECORA project, and potentially with CBMP, as preliminary interest was indicated at CAFF IX. There has also been some discussion with WWF, and their ongoing interest and focus in the circumpolar arctic.

For the Nordic Council, there is an action plan for Greenland, Svalbard and Denmark, and the issue was raised whether it would be useful for CAFF to follow these matters. In particular, its Arctic Strategy and work plan could be useful. One project that may be of interest is trawling of the sea floor and environmental impacts. There is a Bering Sea Conference in early April, with a likely outcome being creating of a Bering Sea Council.

Action Item:

CAFF Chair to forward email to Arctic Council about working group meetings, and requiring different chairs to provide work plans.

18. Closing remarks by Chair.

The meeting was concluded by the CAFF Chair. The next meeting is likely to be in Alaska in November 2003.

CAFF SECRETARIAT 2002

Projected Running Costs: 01 January - 31 December, 2002

REVENUE: USD

Revenue from fixed contributions:	
Canada	18.700
Greenland	15.200
Finland	16.400
Iceland	135.000
Norway	17.600
Sweden	17.600
United States	20.000
Subtotal	240.500
Carryforward from Previous Year:	38.385
Total Revenue for Secretariat	278.885

EXPENDITURES: USD

Expenditures for the Secretariat:	
Staff:	
Salaries and Benefits <i>Snorri, Olga, Magdalena, Tiina</i>	133.012
Contract help	4.007
Subtotal:	137.019
Office:	
Service (Telephone, Fax, e-mail)	10.354
Office Supplies	7.887
Office space (Rent, Heat, Electricity)	23.726
Shipping and Freight	6.941
Container from Canada to Iceland	3.229
Printing	5.485
Equipment (Computers, etc.)	6.474
Bank Services	722
Hospitality	1.957
Subtotal:	66.775
Special publications (printing and distribution)	
CAFF Recommendations	8.402
CPAN Values Brochure	4.763
Subtotal	13.165

EXPENDITURES 2002 CONTINUED

Meeting cost:	
CAFF Board Meeting	9.180
Travel:	
Domestic:	
Akureyri-Reykjavik, taxis and rental cars	6.607
Subtotal/domestic:	6.607
<hr/>	
EXPENDITURES 2002 CONT.	USD
International:	
Airline tickets, hotel, per diem, transportation	29.354
Subtotal international	29.354
Total running costs for 2002	262.100
Surplus at end of year	16.785

CAFF SECRETARIAT 2003
Projected Expenses: January - December, 2003

REVENUE:	USD
Revenue from fixed contributions:	
Canada	18.700
Greenland	15.200
Finland	16.400
Iceland	135.000
Norway	17.600
Sweden	17.600
United States	20.000
Subtotal	240.500
 Carryforward from Previous Year:	 16.785
 Total Revenue for Secretariat	 257.285
EXPENDITURES:	USD
Expenditures for the Secretariat:	
Staff:	
Salaries and Benefits <i>Magdalena Muir and Olga Palsdottir</i>	85.000
Contract help	5.000
Subtotal:	90.000
 Office:	
Service (Telephone, Fax, e-mail)	11.000
Office Supplies	8.000
Office space (Rent, Heat, Electricity)	27.000
Shipping and Freight	7.000
Printing	10.000
Equipment (Computers, etc.)	4.000
Bank Services	800
Hospitality	2.000
Subtotal:	69.800

EXPENDITURES 2003 CONTINUED

Travel:

Domestic:

Airline tickets taxis and rental cars	6.000
Subtotal/domestic:	6.000

International:

CAFF Board Meetings x 2	5.000
CAFF Subroup meetings x 3	7.500
Other meetings x 4	10.000
Subtotal international:	22.500

Special Projects:

1. ACIA - Scientific Report and Policy Document

2 x ACIA Scientific Report meetings	5.000
4 x ACIA Policy Document meetings	10.000
Expenses in relation to meetings (conference calls, arranging/hosting)	5.000
Editing and pre-printing costs	5.000
Subtotal:	25.000

2. ECORA

4 x meetings	10.000
Contract work and/or partial payment of salary in 2003	10.000
Subtotal:	20.000

3. Arctic Marine Protection Strategy (PAME)

Meetings, consultation and participation in Workshop (Oct 2003) and development of strategy	7.500
Subtotal:	7.500

4. CPAN

Poster presentation for Parks Congress	5.000
Subtotal:	5.000

Special Projects total:	57.500
--------------------------------	---------------

Total projected running costs 2003	245.800
---	----------------

Projected surplus	11.485
--------------------------	---------------