



Conference Report



The 10th Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region

Hof, Akureyri, Iceland.
5 – 7 September 2012.

Written by

Arna Gerður Bang, Advisor, International Secretariat, Alþingi, Parliament of Iceland.

Vilborg Ása Guðjónsdóttir, Advisor, International Secretariat, Alþingi, Parliament of Iceland.

Produced by

Þorbjörg Árnadóttir, Information Office, Alþingi, Parliament of Iceland.

Photos in the report are from Silje Bergum Kinsten, Parliament of Norway, Arna Gerður Bang, Parliament of Iceland and Magdalena Tomasik, Arctic Portal, website: www.arcticportal.org

Speeches from the Conference can be found at www.arcticparl.org



Hof Cultural and Conference Center, Akureyri.

Table of content

Foreword	2
Introduction.....	3
Wednesday, 5 September 2012	4
OPENING SESSION	4
Statements, Questions and Comments	7
SESSION 1: Arctic Governance and the Arctic Council	8
Statements, Questions and Comments	11
Thursday, 6 September 2012	13
SESSION 2: Economic Opportunities in the Arctic.....	13
Statements, Questions and Comments	17
Friday, 7 September 2012	18
SESSION 3: Human Development in the Arctic: the Interplay of Research, Authorities and Residents	18
Statements, Questions and Comments	22
Adoption of Conference Statement.....	23
Side Event: Arctic Council Breakfast Seminar	24
Conference Statement.....	25
Program.....	28
List of Participants.....	30

Foreword

Just a few years ago we could all hear on the international media that Iceland was going under. To whichever station you tuned into – the BBC or the CNN or the Kringvarp or the Al Jazeera – the story was everywhere the same: for Iceland, it was more or less over. Back in secret chambers of government people asked if there would be enough medicine. A distinguished American economist advised that first priority was for people not to starve. There were images of our little island sinking into the sea.

But here we are. The sun still rises, the wind blows, the sea comes to shore, the mountains still embrace us – and we continue to breathe in and out, individually and collectively. No one is asking those questions anymore or giving this kind of advice.

Perseverance. If there is one word that perhaps encapsulates the spirit of the North – the extreme conditions, the dramatic scenery, the hostile and yet, attractive living, the multiple cultural and communal gifts of the Arctic, so enduring in their fragility – it is perhaps this, perseverance.

Our generation faces great drama in the life of our planet and yet we all too often imagine we can sleep right through it. The peoples of the Arctic know that we can not. The ice beneath our feet is simply getting too thin not to care – collectively, as mankind. Burdened with the calling of our times, it is our duty to allow the Arctic to persevere and acknowledge the interconnectivity of all living things.

If the Arctic perseveres, there is better chance for the South and our planet as a whole to persevere, as our distinguished visitors from Singapore would be the first to point out.

In order to be able to confront the monumental issues we face, the world needs the Arctic to have stronger structures of governance. A good deal of this Conference dealt with exactly that in practical and concrete ways. These steps might be baby steps, but significant steps just the same. We also addressed the issue of economic opportunities in the Arctic which, clearly, need to be carved in a sustainable, responsible manner for future generations. And we spoke a great deal about research and indigenous knowledge and the ways in which we Arctic parliamentarians can continue to push for sound human development in the Arctic as homeland.

It was an honour to host the 10th Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region here in Iceland and the conference was, I believe, a great success because of the level of engagement by all present. If we keep up that spirit of a collective commitment across borders then ours continues to be an opportunity to actually make a bit of a difference. May the peoples of the Arctic have the right to be cold, may the Arctic continue to persevere.



*Guðfríður Lilja Grétarsdóttir,
Vice-Chair of SCPAR and Chair
of the Icelandic delegation to
SCPAR.*

Tenth Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region

Akureyri, Iceland

3–5 September 2012



Arna Gerður Bang, advisor Icelandic delegation of SCPAR, Guðfríður Lilja Grétarsdóttir Vice-Chair of SCPAR, Morten Høglund, Chair of SCPAR and Bjørn Willy Robstad, Secretary General of SCPAR.

Introduction

The Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region (CPAR) is a parliamentary body comprising delegations appointed by the national parliaments of the eight Arctic states (Canada, Denmark/Greenland, Finland, Iceland, Norway, the Russian Federation, Sweden, and the United States of America) and the European Parliament. Indigenous peoples of the north are Permanent Participants in the Conference. The indigenous people's groups represented are the Aleut International Association, the Arctic Athabaskan Council, the Gwich'in Council International, the Inuit Circumpolar Council, the Sami Parliamentary Council, and the Russian Arctic Indigenous Peoples of the North. In addition there are several observers to the Conference, including non-Arctic nations, non-governmental organizations, interparliamentary groups, and academic institutions. The Conference meets every two years. The first Conference was held in Reykjavík in 1993; since then, all the member states as well as the European Parliament have hosted a conference. The Tenth Conference was held in Akureyri, Iceland, from 3 September to 5 September 2012.

The Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region (SCPAR) oversees Arctic parliamentary cooperation between conferences. The Conference and the Standing Committee both work to further Arctic cooperation, and also act as a parliamentary forum for issues relating to the Arctic Council. The Arctic Council also provides for indigenous participation and focuses on common Arctic issues, particularly sustainable development and environmental protection. Between Conferences, the Standing Committee serves as an observer to the work of the Arctic Council.

The Tenth Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region took place in the town of Akureyri in the north of Iceland. Akureyri is a growing centre of Arctic activities and events. The Conference was held at the Hof Cultural and Conference Center, overlooking the fjord Eyjafjörður. It was hosted by Guðfríður Lilja Grétarsdóttir, Vice-Chair of the SCPAR and Chair of the Icelandic delegation to the SCPAR.

Over 100 people participated in the Conference, including both officials and experts in particular fields. Delegations from all participating parliaments were present. The discussions were rich and informal between scientists, members of parliaments and other participants of the Conference, fruitful and beneficial to all groups.

The Conference's formal sessions were organized around three themes:

- Arctic Governance and the Arctic Council
- Economic Opportunities in the Arctic
- Human Development in the Arctic: Interplay of Research, Authorities and Residents

In addition, there were other themes that recurred in many presentations. These included the 2007-2008 International Polar Year (IPY) and the need to preserve the benefits of the international research efforts that took place during the IPY, as well as to share the actual data. Other themes included concern about the impact of climate change on ice in the Arctic, a focus on sustainable development and more efficient ways of facing these challenges, and the rights of indigenous peoples.

The conference was an opportunity for a rich and in-depth exchange of views among the Arctic states' policy-makers, scientists, experts and officials. Attendees clearly felt the increasing urgency and importance of the themes discussed and of the issue of the Arctic in general.

Wednesday, 5 September 2012

OPENING SESSION

The conference was opened by the Speaker of the Alþingi (the Icelandic Parliament), *H.E. Ms. Ásta Ragnheiður Jóhannesdóttir*, who welcomed participants to this Tenth Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region. In her speech Ms. Jóhannesdóttir stressed the importance of international parliamentary organizations, quoting Mr. Lluís Maria de Puig, former President of the

Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, who said that international parliamentarianism "corresponds to an idea of increasingly present and deeper democracy." She noted that the general rule has been that international parliamentary assemblies follow up after the establishment of an international organization – though sometimes not until decades later. She said that the Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region was a splendid example of an exception to that rule, as it dates back to three years before the establishment of the Arctic Council (AC) – making it possible to say that the international focus on the Arctic was parliamentarily driven from the outset.



Ásta Ragnheiður Jóhannesdóttir, Speaker of Alþingi, Iceland's Parliament and Össur Skarphéðinsson, Minister for Foreign Affairs of Iceland.

Ms. Jóhannesdóttir called attention to the fact that the Alþingi unanimously passed a parliamentary resolution on Iceland's Arctic policy in March 2011. This resolution underlined the focus on the ecologically sustainable and peaceful development of the Arctic region and the importance of the rights of the indigenous peoples of the Arctic. She noted that the Arctic region was increasingly in focus and that new possibilities – and new threats – would emerge in the not-so-distant future. Furthermore, she stressed that Arctic resources, as well as the potential opening of new sailing routes, must be managed carefully and with respect for the peoples and the natural environment of the region.

Ms. Guðfríður Lilja Grétarsdóttir, Member of the Icelandic Parliament and Vice-Chair of the Standing Committee of Arctic Parliamentarians (SCPAR), joined Ms. Jóhannesdóttir in welcoming participants to the conference. She expressed her wish that

the participants would enjoy good conversation, laugh, build new bridges, perhaps even learn a little, speak and listen, and also take the opportunity get to know Iceland a little better. But in the end, the success of the conference would not be measured by the events during the three days in Akureyri; it would be measured by what the participants take back home with them, and marked by how determined they are, at a time of great drama in the life of the planet, to actually go home and put what they say and proclaim into action. She concluded her talk by wishing participants an enjoyable stay and hoping that they find memorable messages to take home.

The next speaker was *Mr. Eiríkur Björn Björgvinsson*, Mayor of Akureyri, who welcomed the participants on behalf of the Town Council. In his talk Mr. Björgvinsson gave a short overview of the various Arctic-focused institutes and initiatives in Akureyri, including the Stefánsson Arctic Institute, the Northern Research Forum, the Arctic Portal, and the secretariats of two Arctic Council working groups, on the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) and the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME). He also highlighted the focus that the University of Akureyri has placed on Arctic education. Lastly, Mr. Björgvinsson expressed the Town Council's support and appreciation for the town's growing role in Arctic activities, its belief in the importance of further activities, and its willingness to take part in this work.

The next speaker was *Dr. Össur Skarphéðinsson*, Minister for Foreign Affairs in Iceland. In his talk Mr. Skarphéðinsson noted that we are currently witnessing the greatest climate change in written history, which will drastically alter the way we develop and utilize the resources of the Arctic. These include the marine riches that we already know, the gas and oil that exists in the Arctic but that we have not been able to or have not dared to harness, and the prospects of completely new transport routes between continents across the Arctic Ocean. He stressed that the Arctic is no longer on the margins – it has already taken center stage, whether in matters of climate change, energy issues, or geopolitics. Mr. Skarphéðinsson noted that he had elevated the Arctic to

priority level in Iceland's foreign policy when he assumed his present portfolio. The Icelandic Parliament had in turn unanimously adopted a resolution on a comprehensive Arctic policy, and all political parties in Iceland today look at Arctic issues as one of the pillars of the country's foreign policy.

In Mr. Skarphéðinsson's view the Arctic Council is now finally coming of age. First, there seems to be a strong and growing political commitment by all Arctic states to the further enhancement of Arctic cooperation, including a renewed dedication and commitment from the United States. Today, all the Arctic countries have made their Arctic policies public, and have thereby made it clear that they share, for the most part, similar visions of how they would like the North to develop. He noted that from his point of view commitment to increased cooperation entails the need for a stronger framework for the Arctic Council. In that respect, an important step was taken with the establishment of a permanent secretariat in Tromsø, which needs to be developed further. Mr. Skarphéðinsson expressed his support for the idea (put forth by the Swedish Chairmanship) of drafting a separate political declaration for the ministerial meeting in Kiruna next year. Such a document should highlight the Arctic Council's shared vision of the future.

As a sign of the Arctic Council's increasing strength, Mr. Skarphéðinsson also pointed out its ever-stronger ability to turn policy into concrete actions and programs, symbolized in the signing of the SAR agreement and further underlined by the decision to develop a similar instrument for marine oil spills. He stressed the importance of continuing along this path by mapping gaps in the infrastructure and response capacity in the North. In his view, this is a prerequisite for wider economic development in the region.

Thirdly, Mr. Skarphéðinsson noted that by agreeing on a common criterion for permanent observers to the Arctic Council, the member states will have reached an important consensus on how to meet the growing interest of outside stakeholders (be it non-Arctic states, NGOs or international

organizations) in observing and taking an active part in the scientific work of the Council. To sum up, Mr. Skarphéðinsson reiterated that the Arctic Council is our strongest tool for cooperation among Arctic nations, and recommended that Arctic Parliamentarians care for it, support it, and work for its increased strength and influence.

Ambassador Gustaf Lind reported on behalf of the Swedish Chairmanship of the Arctic Council. Sweden holds the Chair until May 2013 when Canada takes over. In his talk Ambassador Lind discussed the Swedish Chairmanship's main tasks and emphases. Regarding the mitigation, adaptation to, and monitoring of climate change, he noted the pressure that the Arctic Council under Swedish leadership had put on global climate negotiations, and how it had also pushed the Arctic states to reduce emissions of black carbon and other short-lived climate pollutants. He furthermore noted that an analysis of adaptation measures in Arctic states and closer monitoring of climate change had been high on the agenda. On protecting the Arctic from the risks from oil exploitation he noted that one of the Arctic Council's working groups had been working on the issue of sharing best practices on oil spill prevention, and he also called attention to the forthcoming Arctic Council agreement on oil spill response cooperation.

In his talk Ambassador Lind also discussed the Presidency's emphasis on protecting the environment by setting baselines for Arctic biodiversity and recommendations for future protection, in addition to analyzing the acidification of the Arctic Ocean. A special focus had also been put on sustainable development, in order to create better living conditions in the Arctic. In that regard the emphasis had among other things been on engaging private business, which had not been done in the Arctic Council before, with a special emphasis on corporate social responsibility. Ensuring food and water security in the region had also been high on the agenda.

With regard to strengthening the Arctic Council Ambassador Lind noted the establishment of a permanent secretariat in

Tromsø, which he hoped would be up and running in February or March 2013. He discussed recent work on improving internal procedures, rules, and communication in the Council, and on moving observer applications towards a decision. He concluded by expressing the Swedish Presidency's support for a more long-term vision for the Arctic Council, a vision which would answer questions such as "where do we want to go together?" and "how do we want to develop the Arctic together?"

Following Ambassador Lund's presentation *Mr. Morten Høglund*, Member of the Norwegian Parliament and Chair of the SCPAR, reported on the activities of the Committee since the SCPAR conference in 2010. He noted that the main issue on the agenda of the Standing Committee during the last two years had been Arctic governance. This had resulted in a report, entitled "Arctic Governance in an Evolving Arctic Region," whose main focus was on the Arctic Council. The report analyzed how the Arctic Council can secure its role as the most important instrument for political cooperation in the Arctic. The goal is to develop the Council into a more effective and even more relevant forum, in addition to making it more visible in international debates on Arctic issues. For instance, the chairman of the Council could be allowed to represent the Council in a more active way, contributing to the avoidance of misunderstandings which arise from time to time and to making the Council more visible.



Guðfríður Lilja Grétarsdóttir, Vice-Chair of SCPAR and Morten Høglund, Chair of SCPAR.

In his talk, Mr. Høglund stressed that one fundamental aspect of Arctic governance is that the Arctic countries must govern the Arctic region themselves. Though many different groups, countries, and organizations want to have a say in how the Arctic should be developed and governed, the Arctic countries are the ones responsible for their citizens and the region's development. At the same time, he stressed his belief that the Arctic Council would gain additional strength by allowing interested, relevant countries and organizations to be observers, and he noted that they have already played important roles in shaping the policies of the Arctic Council, particularly through scientific contributions.

Mr. Høglund stressed his belief in education and cooperation as fundamental to meeting current challenges in the Arctic, and noted how cooperation between Arctic parliamentarians and the University of the Arctic had been beneficial, challenging and unique. He furthermore noted that a close dialogue with the Arctic Council was essential to the work of the Standing Committee, in particular so that the Standing Committee can know how best to make recommendations on the future direction of the Council. In that regard, and as the number of observers in the Council increases, it will be essential to remember that the parliamentarians are not just like any other observer organization or observer state, but rather have a special role to play in Arctic cooperation. As an example of this, Mr. Høglund noted a meeting one week earlier with representatives from the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP), the University of the Arctic, and others, at which there was discussion about how the parties could best influence and provide input to the forthcoming negotiations in the Arctic Council on the Kiruna statement. The statement is expected to be adopted at the next Arctic Ministerial Meeting in Kiruna in May 2013, together with the traditional ministerial declaration. It is meant to be a visionary statement about the Arctic, directly inspired by an article in the statement from the last Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region at the European Parliament in 2010. Mr. Høglund noted that since the idea for the statement came from the parliamentarians, they intend to retain the initiative and to give

input on the question of what the Arctic will look like in the future.

Senator Vladimir Torlopov, Head of Delegation, Council of Federation, Russia then gave special greetings to the Conference.

The next speaker was *Mr. Riccardo Migliori*, President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). He began his talk with thanks for the opportunity to participate in the Conference, a meeting which brought the two parliamentary organizations together and strengthened their common aims regarding Arctic policy. He noted that it was an Arctic state, Finland, which provided a common arena for the establishment of the OSCE with the Helsinki Final Act, which remains the organization's guiding force. He added that over the last decade, OSCE parliamentarians have been increasingly focused on the challenges and opportunities presented by climate change. He stressed the importance of common laws for guiding cooperation in the region, and the need for compromise, creativity, technology, and research in the process of exploiting and at the same time protecting the Arctic.

Statements, Questions and Comments

Ms. Lisa Murkowski, Member of the United States Senate, raised the issue of improving communication with the public, with the goal of encouraging the media to portray how the Arctic nations are cooperating on Arctic issues, instead of depicting them as fighting for resources. Ambassador Lind pointed out that the Arctic Council had adopted a communication plan, but the plan alone could not communicate the message. He said it was important to know what to communicate and to work with the right audience, and added that in general putting effort into communication had not been part of the culture of either the Arctic Council or governmental offices. This was, however, changing, among other things with the advent of social media. But it was also a question of whether the Council wanted to spend time and resources on communication. *Ms. Grétarsdóttir* noted that it was crucial to

communicate all the important work being done.

Ms. Sara Olsvig added that the media often portrayed individual nations in a misleading way, for example by portraying Greenland as almost swimming in resources, when it was actually very challenging to grow and build economies and industries in sparsely populated countries like Greenland. She also discussed the challenging task of communicating to non-Arctic states the necessity of hunting seals and whales in the region, and how small Arctic states try to lean on larger Arctic states for assistance in that regard.

Mr. Michael Slipenchuk, Member of the Russian Parliament, expressed his doubts on whether global warming is a consequence of carbon emissions from industry, as Ambassador Lind had indicated in his talk. Ambassador Lind noted that from a scientific point of view it is 100% clear that carbon dioxide creates global warming.

Mr. Pat the Cope Gallagher, Member of the European Parliament, followed up on Ms. Olsvig's discussion of seal hunting, noting how he had seen first-hand the negative implications of the European Union's decision to ban the sale of seal meat into the Union. He noted that it was now up to the WTO to decide on the legality of the ban. He also added that the European Union was looking forward to an important role as an observer of the Arctic Council.

Mr. Finn Sørensen, Member of the Danish Parliament, raised the issue of how Arctic parliamentarians could support the welfare of indigenous peoples when big companies were seeking to exploit natural resources in their area, and mentioned the issue of international labor standards. Ambassador Lind noted that the Arctic Council was working on the issue and that indigenous peoples were well represented in the Council. What was, however, missing was the participation of the business community, which needed to be brought to the table. With regard to labor standards, he noted that this was the responsibility of individual states, with national legislation always prevailing.

SESSION 1: Arctic Governance and the Arctic Council

The first speaker of the session was *Mr. Clifford Lincoln*, former Member of the Canadian Parliament and former chair of the SCPAR. In his talk Mr. Lincoln placed great emphasis on the sustainable development of the Arctic. He began by telling a story about his work with an aboriginal group in Quebec which negotiated an integrated management plan with the government of Quebec for a 10,000-square-mile pilot zone. The aim was to develop the area in a sustainable way, and a decision was made to divide it into zones labeled as green, orange or red. In green areas development could be carried out without any restrictions, in orange areas more caution would need to be taken (with certain requirements for consultation with the people on the ground), and in red areas there would be no development. In Mr. Lincoln's view the Arctic needs to be managed in the same way.

Mr. Lincoln also stressed the need for a vision of the Arctic's future stretching until 2030. Over the 20 years until that time, all the bodies around the Arctic should agree on defining some basic working principles for the sustainable development of the region. He noted that sustainable development had for a long time been a catchphrase with many definitions. For Mr. Lincoln the term represents the integration and long-term wellbeing of the ecosystem, and the duty to take care of and honor others that are living in the region.

With regard to the Arctic Council, Mr. Lincoln emphasized the need to give the organization binding powers to make it more powerful. In his view the Council should also have a stable and adequate budget and a long-term strategic plan, and the Council should, through funding, make it easier for permanent participants to take an active part in the future of the Arctic. Finally, he called on the parliamentarians to renew their call for a vision for the Arctic through 2030, and to push for a call to strengthen the Arctic Council.

The second speaker of the session was *Ms. Ann-Kristine Johansson*, a Member of the

Swedish Parliament and of the SCPAR, and rapporteur on the SCPAR's proposal "Arctic Governance and the Arctic Council." In her talk Ms. Johansson gave an overview of the results of the SCPAR's work in recent years and of the recommendations it made to the Arctic Council during its last conference in 2010.

The first recommendation was that the Arctic Council should become a fully-fledged international organization, with the eight Arctic countries as core members and leaders and indigenous peoples keeping their special status and role as Permanent Participants. The second recommendation was that the Arctic Council should establish a permanent Secretariat and Ms. Johansson welcomed the decision of the Arctic Council's Ministerial Meeting in May 2011 to do so.

The third recommendation was that the Arctic Council should have an adequate and stable budget to support the activities of the Council. The fourth recommendation was that the Arctic Council should establish a panel to provide an assessment of how the Arctic nations can prepare for new opportunities and challenges, and on the basis of such a study, should lay out a vision of the Arctic in 2030. Ms. Johansson noted that the Committee would want the panel to have broad representation, including representatives of indigenous peoples and northern community organizations, the science community, parliamentarians and the business community. To achieve this vision, the Arctic Council should adopt a strategic plan covering a period of five chairmanships (ten years), which should be updated on a

rolling basis to ensure an overall and ongoing coordinated vision. Ms. Johansson welcomed the decision of the Arctic Council Deputy Ministers' Meeting to start the negotiation of a visionary and strategic statement at the next Ministerial Meeting in Kiruna. She noted that parliamentarians would be more than willing to contribute in a constructive way to the process of drafting the statement, and that they look forward to the invitation of the Arctic Council chairmanship.

The fifth recommendation was that the Arctic Council should arrange an Arctic Summit with the participation of the heads of state or government of the Arctic Council member states, and, of course, the leaders of the Permanent Participants. Ms. Johansson furthermore reiterated the Committee's call for yearly Ministerial Meetings of the Arctic Council, involving representatives at the level of Ministers of Foreign Affairs, in addition to regular meetings of other key, relevant ministers.

The sixth recommendation was to explore new areas for the creation of legally binding instruments. In that regard Ms. Johansson recognized the first binding legal agreement between the Arctic States (on Search and Rescue) as a pioneering achievement, and welcomed the task forces set up by the Council to negotiate agreements on Arctic marine oil pollution and preparedness and response, and the task force on short-lived climate forces. She suggested research and education as a possible area for a new agreement, in addition to an agreement on how to develop and secure sustainable and eco-friendly tourism in the Arctic.



Valur Ingimundarson, Professor, University of Iceland, Ann-Kristine Johansson, MP, Swedish Parliament, Pat the Cope Gallagher, MP, European Parliament, Lisa Murkowski, Senator, US Senate, Clifford Lincoln, former MP, Canadian Parliament, former Chair of SCPAR and Bjørn Willy Robstad, Secretary General of SCPAR.

The seventh recommendation revolved around the safeguarding of the role of the Permanent Participants and indigenous peoples, by securing funding for their participation in meetings. .

The eighth and final recommendation concerned the observers to the Arctic Council, with the SCPAR concluding that observer status should be granted cautiously and after careful consideration, always taking into account the paramount long-term integrity of the Arctic and its peoples.

The final speaker of the first session was *Dr. Valur Ingimundarson*, Professor at the University of Iceland, who gave a talk titled “A Privileged Club or a Global Forum: Arctic Governance and the Role of the Arctic Council.” Dr. Ingimundarson began his talk by noting that not long ago questions were raised about the Arctic Council’s continued relevance and viability, leading to intensified calls for changing it from a decision-shaping body into a decision-making one. Predictions of the Arctic Council’s death had not come true. On the contrary, following the controversial Ilulissat and Chelsea meetings of the Arctic Five – which were criticized by representatives of the indigenous peoples and the three excluded Arctic states – more effort had been put into strengthening the Council. The outcomes of the 2011 Nuuk Ministerial Meeting – the creation of a permanent Arctic secretariat, the establishment of criteria for admitting new Arctic Council permanent observers, and the SAR Agreement – had been hailed as a sign of its renewal as an institutional body and as disproving the charge that the Arctic Five forum had relegated it to the sidelines of Arctic governance. What is more, the SAR agreement was evidence of the Arctic Council evolving into a decision-making body.

In his talk Dr. Ingimundarson set out to offer a critique of the SCPAR’s proposal “Arctic Governance in an Evolving Arctic Region.” In his view the proposal reflects a willingness to buttress the governance structure of the Arctic Council without jeopardizing or subverting its underlying premises. However, at the same time it warrants some deconstructive textual reading and analysis. While the proposal highlights important

questions about Arctic governance, it is ambiguous or silent on other ones. Thus, the text contains tensions that need to be addressed and engaged.

In Dr. Ingimundarson’s view the call for an Arctic vision and a ten-year strategic plan developed by a panel with broad representation sharpens the focus of the Arctic Council. The same can be said about the proposal for holding an Arctic Summit involving the heads of state or government of the Arctic Council member states, as well as the leaders of the permanent participants, and for calling for annual rather than biennial meetings of Foreign Ministers at the Arctic Council. Both ideas would give the Arctic Council more international weight. As one of the proposal’s weaknesses Dr. Ingimundarson noted that the Standing Committee does not put forward any very bold or ambitious ideas about cooperation that could serve as a suitable basis for legally binding agreements along the lines of the SAR agreement and the prospective agreement on oil spill prevention. The Committee only mentions Arctic research and education and sustainable, eco-friendly tourism, which are issues that should prove relatively easy for the Arctic Council to come to an agreement on. The Standing Committee has supported the mandatory code for ships in polar waters developed by the International Maritime Organization (IMO), and this could also have been prioritized in the proposal.

Dr. Ingimundarson also noted the proposal’s silence on another important issue: Arctic fisheries. At the International Polar Year conference earlier in 2012, two thousand scientists had called for a moratorium on Arctic high seas fishing to allow time to research catch limits and develop an integrated international Arctic fisheries management plan. The issue is a controversial one that concerns all the Arctic states, but is nevertheless not mentioned in the proposal. Finally, Dr. Ingimundarson noted that there is no sign of ending, in a formal way, the taboo on discussing security issues within the Arctic Council. He found this surprising, given the fact that the SAR agreement is a clear instance of a soft security issue.

In Dr. Ingimundarson's view the willingness to strengthen the institutional structure of the Arctic Council and its international cloud is tempered by its absolute insistence on the status quo when it comes to the prerogatives of the powers of the permanent members. Even if it is clear that the admission of states that have applied for permanent observer status would enhance the international stature of the Arctic Council and its legitimacy, the role of the observers is strictly limited. Instead of viewing the observer role as a potential threat, in Dr. Ingimundarson's view it could also be seen as a stabilizing and confidence-building measure designed to reassure non-Arctic peoples that Arctic governance is practiced in an open way. Another source of tension in the proposal revolves around what may be termed the functional and inter-governmental aspects of Arctic governance. On the one hand, the SAR agreement is welcomed as a legally binding and normative instrument which strengthens the Arctic Council. On the other hand, there is a caveat that such cooperation traditionally only involves states and that the structure of the Arctic Council will not necessarily be used in the process.

When it comes to jurisdictional boundaries and resource access, Dr. Ingimundarson noted that individual state interests in the Arctic still prevail. But it is when increased internationalization and regionalization coincides with state interests – in cases such as commitment to UNCLOS, the internationally-binding agreement on Search and Rescue, the prospective mandatory code for ships in polar waters, and a possible Arctic Council agreement on oil-spill prevention mechanisms – that the possibility to move forward on governance increases. Hence, the tension between these two issues can, in fact, be interpreted as a forward-looking development. As for accommodating outside, non-Arctic interest in the region, the problem is more intractable. There, the danger is of trying to have it both ways – to enhance the international standing of the Arctic Council, while making no real changes in an effort to preserve the privileged position of Arctic Council insiders.

In Dr. Ingimundarson's view the decision by the Arctic Council to establish criteria for

future permanent observers also raises some critical questions. It has been hailed as a normative and transparent way of admitting observers to the Council. But in his view it is not only cynics who argue that the Nuuk decision was a postponement strategy which masked real differences among the Arctic states over inclusion and exclusion. In this way, extra time was bought for decisions on the applications from China, the European Commission, and other states. Dr. Ingimundarson noted that a case can certainly be made for a formula to deal with increased interest from non-Arctic states in participating in the Arctic Council's work, and that it is reasonable to insist on a real contribution from applicants when it comes to Arctic issues. But the possible inclusion of European countries or bodies should not mean the exclusion of Asian states. To preserve the credibility of the process, it is important that the admission criteria not be used as a segregation tool. Similarly, if powerful external actors with Arctic interests, such as China and the EU, are continually shut out, they will – in the name of their political and economic influence – force themselves, in the end, to the negotiating table. In Dr. Ingimundarson's view it does not serve collective interests in the Arctic to follow a course that could stoke future geopolitical friction in the region, and although there is no need to issue dire warnings at this stage, there are nonetheless protectionist mechanisms at work, mechanisms which are not absent from the Standing Committee's proposal.

Statements, Questions and Comments

Mr. Ivar Kristiansen, Member of the Norwegian Parliament, started the debate by stating that of course there was a race for resources in the Arctic, and that that was the main reason for international attention and the need for cooperation. He stressed the importance of parliamentarians attending to these issues, and not just expecting individual governments to do the work. He noted that the United Nations Law of the Sea was a good enough mechanism to solve all issues; outside bodies were not required.

Mr. Dennis Bevington, Member of the Canadian Parliament, stressed the need for

full cooperation in research, in order to be able to provide the full picture. He also underlined the necessity of handling Arctic issues with care – otherwise, the Arctic states would certainly not set an example for the rest of the world.

Ms. Anita Brodén, Member of the Swedish Parliament, stressed the importance of acting on Arctic issues, with parliamentarians and governments taking steps forward now while the window is still open. She expressed her hope that the result of the meeting would be a strongly worded resolution, with its content communicated to the world.

Ms. Helena Leander, also a Member of the Swedish Parliament, asked Mr. Clifford Lincoln whether he could elaborate on how the green, orange and red system could be put in use. Mr. Lincoln explained that it had taken two decades to develop the system, and that the most important element was establishing clear principles for making the system permanent. That way everybody knew where they stood – the companies, the government and the indigenous peoples. He added that, of course, the plans had involved participation in resource sharing by the indigenous peoples, and sadly that was not generally accepted yet.

Ms. Elizabeth Saagulik Hensley, Public Policy Liaison to the NANA Regional Corporation of Alaska, thanked Senator Murkowski for participating in the conference, stressing the importance of having someone who knows what it is like to live in the Arctic as a participant in international events like this meeting in Akureyri – someone who knows the challenges faced in Alaska and by the indigenous communities there.

Mr. Ingimundarson agreed with the idea of looking at Arctic issues in global terms, although the regional and local perspectives were also important. All three needed to be taken into account. Resource potential was of course the main issue, but he pointed out that some of the external actors interested in the region were mainly concerned with environmental factors.

Mr. Eirik Sivertsen, Member of the Norwegian Parliament, argued that the risk of conflict in the Arctic was increasing, and that the Arctic nations were responsible for finding solutions to avoid military confrontation. He underlined the importance of social responsibility, especially when it came to the extraction of resources, and of protecting the people living in the region.

Ms. Olsvig noted that there was one thing missing in the debate, and that was the responsibilities of the indigenous peoples themselves, who were a part of Arctic governance and developed principles and declarations on their own. In this regard she called for the inclusion of indigenous peoples in all debates and for increased mutual respect. In regard to drilling for oil along the coast of Greenland, she added that the country needed oil to survive, especially given that it could no longer export seal or whale meat. Finally, she noted that the vulnerability of cargo ships in the Greenlandic EEZ should be prioritized.

Mr. Sergey Kharuchi, President of the Russian Arctic Indigenous Peoples of the North and Chair of the Yamal Regional Parliament, noted the progress that Arctic cooperation had made throughout the years, especially with regard to relations between national governments and indigenous peoples. He stressed that goals could not be achieved if indigenous peoples were neglected; their experience, traditional rules, and way of life needed to be taken into account. He praised the emphasis in Mr. Lincoln's talk on the importance of the rights of indigenous peoples, and stressed the importance of openness and trust building in Arctic cooperation, including with external actors who provide knowledge and expertise. Lastly, Mr. Kharuchi, who had been taking part in Arctic cooperation for 16 years but would soon be leaving politics, thanked everyone for their cooperation throughout the years.

Thursday, 6 September 2012

SESSION 2: Economic Opportunities in the Arctic

Ms. Lisa Murkowski, Member of the US Senate, gave the first presentation of the Conference's second session, which focused on economic opportunities in the Arctic. She began by saying that the United States was now beginning to realize that it is an Arctic nation, and Arctic issues are consequently gaining traction in Washington. This came in large part because of the tremendous natural resource potential that the Arctic region holds.



Lisa Murkowski, Senator, US Senate.

Ms. Murkowski discussed the U.S. Geological Survey's (USGS) Circum-Arctic Resource Appraisal from 2008, which estimates the undiscovered oil and gas north of the Arctic Circle to consist of 90 billion barrels of oil, 1,669 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, and 44 billion barrels of natural gas liquids, for a total of 412 billion barrels of oil and oil-equivalent natural gas. Seventy percent of the undiscovered oil resources are estimated to lie in five areas: Arctic Alaska, the Amerasia Basin, the East Greenland Rift Basins, the East Barents Basin, and West Greenland-East Canada. Of great interest to Alaska, and to the United States, are the estimated 30 billion barrels of oil off of Alaska's north coast. To put that into perspective, the U.S. Energy Information Administration reports that in 2010 the United States, as a whole, had 23.2 billion barrels of proven crude oil reserves. As for natural gas, the USGS appraisal estimates that 70 percent of undiscovered natural gas is in three areas: the West Siberian Basin, the East Barents Basin, and Arctic Alaska. With

30 billion barrels of oil and 221 trillion cubic feet of natural gas in the Arctic Alaska OCS, there is a significant amount of interest in this issue in the area. Ms. Murkowski also noted the Arctic's tremendous potential for the discovery of rich mineral deposits, including rare earth minerals, cobalt, lithium, and molybdenum.

In her talk, Ms. Murkowski also directed attention to increased circumpolar maritime traffic via sea lanes that are now open for ever longer periods of time. She noted that the US Office of Naval Intelligence estimates that maritime activity in the Arctic increased 5.1 percent each year from 2008 to 2011, with the trend moving upward. Over the same period, cargo ship activity increased by 36 percent and tanker activity by 114 percent. However, due to the lack of major transshipment or regional hubs for cargo routing in the Arctic the route might not be a suitable option for shipping companies. Ms. Murkowski stressed the need to make the Arctic a shipping hub in order to realize the full benefit of circumpolar navigation and to lower the cost of shipping products to the communities in the Arctic region. She also discussed the increase in Arctic tourism, which grew by almost eight percent between 2008 and 2011 due to more ships in the region. In that regard she noted the need to address the lack of infrastructure, support capability, navigational aids, communication capability and ice-breaking capability in the Arctic, which affects its potential to become a cruise destination and shipping hub.

Ms. Murkowski also provided an update on the status of the Convention on the Law of the Sea in the United States Senate. The treaty is still pending. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has held a series of hearings on the treaty, building strong national security and economic arguments for its passage, but opposition remains among those who are not convinced of its merits and are concerned about its impact on the sovereignty of the United States. Ms. Murkowski noted that there was hope that the Senate would consider the treaty following the November 2012 elections, and although hurdles remain there seemed to be greater awareness and understanding of the issue. She was however not optimistic that

the treaty would be reconsidered again in the near future if it were pushed off yet again to a new Congress.

Lastly, Ms. Murkowski stressed the need to keep in mind the impact of Arctic activities on the indigenous peoples of the Arctic. On that note, she expressed her satisfaction with the indigenous populations' permanent observer status in the Arctic Parliamentary Conference and the Arctic Council.

The second speaker was *Ms. Johanna Ojala-Niemelä*, Member of the Finnish Parliament and Vice-Chair of the Finnish delegation to the SCPAR, who presented a report on economic opportunities in the Arctic on behalf of the Standing Committee. The report places special emphasis on the importance of basing economic cooperation on sustainable development in Northern and Arctic areas, with strategic environmental impact assessment being the central tool. In this regard Ms. Ojala-Niemelä stressed the importance of Arctic states being the primary actors in a cooperative effort which also involves many outside players.

The report identifies three major areas for cooperation: transport and logistics, energy, and mining. Regarding transport and logistics, Ms. Ojala-Niemelä stressed that new and efficient connections and transport networks are a precondition for increased economic activity in the Arctic. She also noted that the work of the International Maritime Organization to establish a compulsory Polar Code needed to be speeded up, and that in that work the Arctic Council and the Arctic states could draw upon the results that have already been achieved in the Baltic Sea region. Safety could furthermore be improved by providing necessary infrastructure for the shipping industry, such as broadband connections, telecommunications, and environmentally sound solutions for ports and shipping routes. In order for opportunities for direct economic cooperation between states and private enterprises in the region to be viable, it would be important to provide the necessary technology to keep ports open under varying ice conditions, to improve monitoring and surveillance of all traffic in the Arctic Ocean, and to develop an

integrated system for sharing traffic data. Functioning transport routes could become an important asset for the Arctic region when global transport patterns change; these patterns involve not only routes between Asia, Europe, and North America through northern seas and harbors in the region, but also transit traffic along north-south corridors. Ms. Ojala-Niemelä stressed the importance of closer subregional cooperation and coordination when developing new transport strategies, and noted that the Arctic states have new possibilities for widening their cooperation in that regard and also for establishing subregional bodies to look at transport and logistics in a way that can provide added value to purely national plans. Ms. Ojala-Niemelä finally noted that in her home country, Finland, know-how has been developed in a number of areas essential to Arctic development, such as shipping, logistical solutions, construction and house building, and green mining and clean technology, and also in the area of advanced technology to prevent and respond to environmental accidents. As part of its chairmanship of the Nordic Council in 2012 Finland would be organizing a seminar in November with a focus on subregional cooperation, particularly in northern Scandinavia.

On cooperation in the field of energy Ms. Ojala-Niemelä noted that oil and gas reserves in the Arctic are of great importance for energy security in the region and beyond, with the energy industry offering considerable opportunities for local businesses and service providers. The challenge will be to raise capacity and know-how to a new and higher level in order to meet the demands of a quickly growing industry. The potential is huge and diverse, with opportunities to develop water and wind power, geothermal energy, and in the long run perhaps also wave energy.

On cooperation in the field of mining Ms. Ojala-Niemelä stressed that in order to succeed, the sector will need new technology and energy resources as well as investments in transportation and logistics. It would be useful to create national mineral strategies and jointly analyze them. These strategies should outline how Arctic states can develop

their mining sectors in a sustainable way, and ensure that the production of strategic minerals benefits the economies of the Arctic states, both locally and nationally.

Finally, Ms. Ojala-Niemelä underlined the importance of science in all the national Arctic strategies, as well as the importance of continued close cooperation between governments, indigenous groups, officials, the academic community and industry. She concluded her talk by stating that the Arctic Council had provided a good forum for this work and expressed high hopes that a strengthened Arctic Council could serve future cooperation even better.

The third speaker was Dr. Mikhail Slipenchuk, Deputy Chair of the Russian State Duma Committee on Natural Resources, Environment and Ecology. In his talk Dr. Slipenchuk gave an overview of ways to achieve international stabilization in the Arctic region. First, he saw the adoption of documents regulating the contentious issues related to the status and activities of the states in the Arctic as vital. This includes the completion of the maritime delimitation in the Arctic Ocean as well as giving the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea universal nature. Secondly, he believed that the Arctic Council needs to be empowered, including by creating an international arbitration and mediation center. Thirdly, he thought that the Arctic countries need to set up obligatory monitoring of ships, aircraft, and offshore and other equipment, in their respective sectors. Fourthly, effective discussion among Arctic countries of problems and their practical solutions needs to be developed. In Dr. Slipenchuk's view the main objectives in the development of the Arctic region are the following:

- to develop a fundamentally new organizational and legal basis for international public-private partnership in the Arctic;
- to work out the concept of the region's development in the interests of all the Arctic states;
- to attract financial institutions to organize and manage large-scale financial and commodity and resource flow;

- to identify ways of international cooperation involving states and private capital;
- to create an "Arctic bank consortium" to raise capital on public markets under the guarantee of the governments of the Arctic states.

The fourth speaker was *Mr. Tero Vauraste*, President and CEO of Arctica Shipping Ltd, presenting views from the business sector. Mr. Vauraste approached the topic from a Finnish maritime perspective, with the three key elements of his talk being Finnish ice-breaking know-how, opportunities in the Arctic, and public-private partnership. He started by noting that close to 90% of Finnish foreign trade is transported via sea routes, and that Finland is bordered by the Baltic Sea, or more precisely by the Gulf of Finland to the south, the Archipelago Sea to the southwest and the Gulf of Bothnia to the west and northwest. The Baltic Sea freezes every winter and conditions vary a lot from one year to the next. The minimum ice coverage, when only the northern areas are frozen, is approximately 50,000 square kilometers. During harsh winters, the whole Baltic Sea is ice-covered – a total area of 400,000 square kilometers. Due to the needs of Finnish and international trade, year-round maritime and harbor infrastructure has been developed in Finland; of the more than 60 commercial ports, 23 are kept open on an all-year basis. All these ports can be iced in during the winter. Icebreaker services thus have a long history in Finland, with the first formal icebreaker being commissioned as early as 1890. Icebreakers were, and still are, needed to assist commercial vessels going to and from the 23 Finnish winter ports and thus keep the country going. This need helped to create an industry in Finland, centering on icebreaker design, construction, and operational know-how, which was built up rapidly. Today, the current worldwide icebreaker fleet consists of around 100 vessels, approximately 60 of which were designed and built in Finland. Mr. Vauraste noted that this experience can now be enhanced and developed in the Arctic areas, with the Finnish maritime and other industries supporting this development in a sustainable and safe way. Finland has experience and know-how in Arctic ship

design, Arctic shipbuilding, icebreaking operations, ice management, oil spill response, and low emission engine technical solutions, including conversions.

Mr. Vauraste went on to discuss opportunities for Arctica's current fleet and the challenges ahead, including operations financing. He noted that in an Arctic panel organized by the Finnish Embassy in Washington in July 2012 Arctica suggested a public-private partnership model for financing new icebreaker fleets. Instead of taking a huge amount of money from taxpayers' pockets at once, a financing model based on a long-term contractual basis would provide an opportunity to spread the cost over a longer time frame. Finally, he recommended that Arctic parliamentarians and the Arctic Council study and make use of public-private partnerships in icebreaking investments, and in enhancing the current fleet capacity, combating oil spills, and in emission conversions to mitigate the risks of oil spills in the Arctic.

The fifth and last speaker of the second session was *Mr. Felix Tschudi*, Chairman of Tschudi Shipping Co., who also presented views from the business sector. In his talk Mr. Tschudi gave an overview of the dynamics that influence the short-term use of the Northern Sea Route. In his view they are the following:

- the freight market level for different shipping segments;
- the time sensitivity of markets and cargoes;
- the time required for passage (ice conditions and waiting time);
- the draft limitations, which determine the size of the vessels and tracks;
- the availability of ice class tonnage in different segments and sizes;
- cost elements, including bunker prices, the cost of insurance, and piracy threats.

For long-term use Mr. Tschudi sees climatic conditions as the main concern. In his view the economic opportunities in the Arctic related to the Northern Sea Route are numerous. This includes opportunities for the shipbuilding industry, shipping companies,

cargo owners, and companies that construct specialized ice class vessels for Arctic operations or produce modules and structures serving offshore oil and gas and mining in the Arctic. In addition, the route offers a new and shorter transit route between the Pacific and the Atlantic markets and a shorter trade route for imports and exports between the North Atlantic and the North Pacific. The route can furthermore be used for cost-efficient and time-saving positioning for ship repair and conversions. The route also provides new opportunities for shipping resources into and out of the Arctic and utilizing new, closer sources of industrial raw materials as well as new Arctic energy resources.

Mr. Tschudi noted that his company's objective was for the Northern Sea Route to be considered a safe and predictable commercial alternative to the Suez Canal and the Cape route during the ice-free season. In the medium term the company believes regional destination shipping and logistics will be the most relevant activity along the Northern Sea Route. In Mr. Tschudi's view High North logistics require joint regional solutions to joint regional challenges, and lack of infrastructure and people are joint bottlenecks for all Arctic nations.

Finally, Mr. Tschudi shared his thoughts on emergency preparedness and cooperation in the Arctic. In his view the best safety measures against accidents are the Russian mandatory ice breaker escort and regulatory requirements. The Arctic Council agreement on developing a joint framework for SAR was also important as the member countries are the ones with an interest in developing the resources of the region while keeping potential negative effects at a minimum. He also noted that the increased economic activity in the region would improve the general preparedness for responding to potential accidents – due to a higher availability of vessels, equipment and people – provided necessary coordination is facilitated. Finally, he warned against introducing overly costly regulations too soon, to avoid stifling the development of shorter-distance transportation, given that the direct economic benefit was limited at this stage.

Statements, Questions and Comments

Ms. Helena Leander, Member of the Swedish Parliament, argued for a moratorium on further exploration and drilling for oil and gas in the Arctic. In her view petroleum extraction in the Arctic is not a good idea, with the cost of mitigation being far less than the cost of the consequences of climate change, and since extraction is risky and the impact of potential disasters very real.

Ms. Silvia Modig, Member of the Finnish Parliament, representing the Nordic Council, agreed with her colleague from Sweden but stressed that she was speaking on behalf of the Nordic Council. She noted that the Council placed importance on sustainable development in the Arctic and the protection of the rights of indigenous peoples. The Nordic Council was interested in further strengthening cooperation with the Arctic Council and all other stakeholders.

Mr. Geir-Ketil Hansen, Member of the Norwegian Parliament, pointed out that there were several good reasons for developing other energy resources in the Arctic than oil and gas, with an emphasis on renewable energy. He noted that the Arctic countries have a variety of expertise in that area, with Iceland being the leader in geothermal energy, Denmark having specialized in green power, and Norway and Sweden having developed hydropower and more. He emphasized the importance of a reduction of black carbon emissions, which would be an important contribution to sustainable development in Arctic and the world.

Mr. Slipenchuk disagreed with Ms. Leander, saying that there was a good time for everything and that today gas was the cleanest, cheapest, and clearest electricity provider. He noted that he was not saying that we should not take care of the environment, but that it was not an option to reduce the standard of living by not exploiting the resources available. When cheaper options become available we could consider other options.

Mr. Lincoln noted that while Mr. Tschudi's presentation had been very interesting, he

was worried about his warning that stricter regulations could destroy shipping in the North. In his view that went straight to the core of what the debate is about. He stressed his view that the utmost precaution should be taken, and the strictest possible regulations adopted, even if that would make shipping more difficult.

Mr. Tschudi replied by saying that while he agreed with Mr. Lincoln on the importance of strict rules and regulations, he was simply saying that if, for example, a full ban on fuel oil would be introduced today, usage of the Northern Sea Route would be out of the question. In that regard he noted that emissions would decrease if the Northern Sea Route could be used rather than the routes used today. Phasing out the usage of fuel oil over time would be a better option.

Ms. Ingalill Olsen, Member of the Norwegian Parliament, pointed out that the most important renewable economic resource is fish. She noted that fish stocks were now creating new patterns and crossing economic zones due to global warming, which required increased cooperation between fishing nations in the Arctic. She stressed the good experience Norway has had of cooperation with Russia on the distribution of fish stocks in the Barents Sea, which she believes other nations could learn from.

Mr. Søren Bo Søndergaard, Member of the European Parliament, stressed that possibilities other than oil and gas should be concentrated on. He asked Ms. Murkowski to elaborate on why oil groups did not see Alaska as a viable option for oil exploration any longer. Ms. Murkowski replied by saying that the main reason for delays in oil exploration off the coast of Alaska was very strict regulations due to high standards, in addition to delays in issuing permits. She added that it was very expensive to extract these resources and it became even more expensive with strict environmental standards.

Ms. Olsvig brought up the topic of issues related to cruise ships sailing around the Arctic. She stressed the importance of moving forward in order to reach an

agreement on the safety issues involved. She also called attention to the insufficient surveillance capacity in the region. With regard to the idea of halting all ideas of resource extraction in the Arctic she asked how the economies of the North were supposed to be built up without any extraction. Given that Greenland could now not export seal or whale meat, what would it export?

Mr. Tschudi agreed on the issue of addressing the safety of cruise ships and the problem of insufficient surveillance capacity. He noted that some areas of the Arctic were open and others less accessible, with many areas unsurveyed, areas which should thus not be used.

Mr. Henning Skumsvoll, Member of the Norwegian Parliament, highly disagreed with Ms. Leander, saying that the resources in the North were very great and that they should be developed, but in a safe way. He expressed his hope that new sea routes would be opened. He noted that the people who had been living there for thousands of years needed to be considered, and stressed the importance of listening to scientists and the people who know the area.

A representative from the Arctic Portal asked Mr. Slipenchuk to elaborate on a law that the Russian Duma had passed which excluded Murmansk from any involvement with the Northern Sea Route. Mr. Slipenchuk replied by saying that he knew of no such law. Mr. Alexander Kurdyumo, also a Member of the Russian Duma, was also not familiar with the legislation. Mr. Tschudi intervened and explained that this was a misunderstanding due to different definitions.

Friday, 7 September 2012

SESSION 3: Human Development in the Arctic: the Interplay of Research, Authorities and Residents

Ms. Sara Olsvig, one of two Greenlandic members of the Danish Parliament, was the first speaker of the last session. She began

her talk by discussing the importance of the rights of indigenous peoples in the Arctic, noting specifically how the adoption of the UN declaration on those rights had been an important milestone for Sami and Inuit leaders. She expressed her satisfaction that the SCPAR continues to emphasize the importance of recognizing indigenous peoples as part of its policy-making and decision-making body. She furthermore stressed the importance of the Arctic Council continuing to strengthen and maintain its unique structure, a structure which shows that the focus is on the peoples and the communities of the region. She also noted that the SCPAR continues to push for an agenda with the human dimension in focus, and expressed her consent with the Committee's recommendations to the Arctic Council on strengthening the human dimension of Arctic activities, research, governance, and living.

Ms. Olsvig also discussed the 2004 Arctic Human Development Report, which outlined many of the most important aspects of human development in the Arctic and many important related research areas. The report also covered Arctic economic systems (which are often vulnerable), issues of health and education, and issues of resource governance and international relations. In her view the report is still an instrumental document which has served as a good foundation for further research and policy making in the field. Many of the report's recommendations have been acted upon by policy makers, local communities and the research community of the Arctic. She noted that the SCPAR very much welcomes the second, forthcoming Arctic Human Development Report, which will also serve as a tool for an overarching evaluation of human development in the Arctic. The core questions are how we make sure that the peoples and societies of the Arctic are not undermined and diminished as the Arctic changes ever more rapidly, and how we ensure sustainable development in the Arctic. Such development must not only focus on economic opportunities, such as oil and gas, shipping and mining, mega-industries and all that follows, but also on the development of our societies and cultures. Ms. Olsvig noted that very rapid changes in societies whose

members are small in numbers, combined with worldwide interest in the region, could end up tipping things in an unhealthy way.

In her talk Ms. Olsvig also discussed the increase in industrial activities in the Arctic and the danger that the major industrial projects already underway or in planning could become the new colonizers of the North. She noted that some decades had now passed since the inception of decolonization in many of the SCPAR member countries and regions, and stressed the need to learn from the experience of colonization and not make the same mistakes again. Some of the social and cultural problems in Greenland resemble those in many other former colonies; the state is trying to meet these challenges by ensuring education, health care, and social development, at the same time as it tries to build a sustainable economy.

Furthermore, Ms. Olsvig noted the central need to define “sustainability,” a word often used inappropriately, and the need to ensure that protection of the environment and protection of societies goes hand in hand. She reiterated that it is of the utmost importance that the rights of the peoples of the Arctic be respected and protected, and that the Arctic peoples themselves be the decision makers with regards to the development of their societies – including the development of resources, industries, shipping routes, and other activities in the Arctic. She finally stressed the need for the SCPAR to maintain its role as a spokesperson for the people of the Arctic and advocate a strong human dimension in the development of the region.

The second speaker of the session was *Mr. Larry Miller*, Member of the Canadian Parliament, who discussed Canada’s role in the Arctic Council and its upcoming chairmanship in 2013. He noted that during his seventh consecutive annual northern tour, Canadian Prime Minister Steven Harper had announced many projects that aim to develop and support Canada’s North and the Arctic region as a whole. He furthermore announced that Ms. Leona Aglukkaq, Canadian Minister of Health, would chair the Arctic Council in 2013 on behalf of the

Canadian government. Mr. Miller also discussed Canada’s Northern Strategy, noting that it aims to meet the challenges and opportunities of a changing north and will focus on four priority areas:

- exercising Canada’s Arctic sovereignty;
- protecting its environmental heritage;
- promoting social and economic development;
- improving and devolving Northern governance.

He stressed that the Arctic Council must be at the forefront of convincing EU members countries, which continue to ban products from the Arctic region, to stop doing so, for the sake of creating and supporting economic development in the region. In that regard members of the Council must be prepared to back up the Council’s statements much more aggressively than they have up to this point. Finally, Mr. Miller noted that Canada was working hard to protect its northern and Arctic regions through the Arctic Council, through its Northern Strategy, and via continued cooperation with other countries in the Arctic region; Canada is committed to the goal of a healthy, prosperous, and secure Arctic region.



Vladimir Torlopov, Senator, Council of Federation, Russia, Johanna Ojala-Niemelä, MP, Finnish Parliament and Larry Miller, MP, Canadian Parliament.

The session’s third speaker was *Mr. Dennis Bevington*, also a Member of the Canadian Parliament. In his talk Mr. Bevington placed special emphasis on the importance of research in the Arctic, stressing its value for life in the communities of the North. In his

view sustainability is the fundamental challenge of the North, with one of the key questions being whether we can recreate the sustainability that we had, while maintaining a modern way of life, or whether we only have the option to engage in some form of resource development dictated by others. Mr. Bevington expressed his belief in the need for sustainability and resource development to be supported by research and action. He also discussed the high and escalating cost of living in the North, which he views as completely unsustainable. He noted the high cost of energy resources as one of the main reasons for that development, and stressed the need for renewable energy solutions in the North.

The fourth speaker was *Dr. Joan Nymand-Larsen*, Senior Scientist at the Stefansson Arctic Institute in Akureyri. She gave a presentation on the beginnings of work on the Second Arctic Human Development Report, AHDR-II: Regional Processes and Global Linkages (2011-2014). She also gave follow-up information on the Arctic Social Indicators project, ASI-II (2009-2011). Larsen stated that the first Arctic Human Development Report, issued in 2004, was a priority project of the Icelandic Chairmanship of the Arctic Council (2002-2004) and it provided a baseline description of human development in the Arctic. The report was unique in the sense that it treated the Arctic as a single integrated region despite that fact that the region encompasses areas under the jurisdiction of all eight Arctic states. Arctic societies have a well-deserved reputation for resilience in the face of change. But today they are facing an unprecedented combination of rapid and stressful changes involving environmental processes, cultural developments, economic changes, industrial developments, and political changes. The AHDR-II will provide an update to this baseline, in whose terms trends that affect sustainable human development among residents of the circumpolar world can be evaluated. The report will compare and contrast cultural, economic, political, and social conditions throughout the Arctic with similar conditions in other parts of the eight Arctic countries and in the world at large.

Larsen also discussed the Arctic Social Indicators (ASI) project. She said the main objectives were to devise and implement a limited set of indicators which reflect key aspects of human development, are tractable in terms of measurement, and can be monitored at reasonable cost in order to facilitate the long-term monitoring of human development in the Arctic.

Larsen also recalled that at the Ninth Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region in Brussels in 2010 there was support for Iceland's initiative in proposing a second Arctic Human Development Report in 2014, which would bring together state-of-the-art knowledge from the IPY about Arctic societies and their welfare in a global context. Furthermore, she reported that the Nuuk Ministerial Declaration in 2011 noted the need for a comprehensive overview of human development in the Arctic and called for an assessment of the current state of human development in the Arctic and its relationship to climate change and other factors affecting Arctic communities.

Larsen mentioned some of the main objectives and rationales of the AHDR-II. One is to provide an update to the baseline, in whose terms trends that affect sustainable human development among residents of the circumpolar world can be evaluated. Another is to compare and contrast cultural, economic, political, and social conditions in the Arctic with similar conditions in other parts of the eight Arctic countries and in the world at large. Another is to facilitate comparisons across the Arctic of key elements of human development and, in the process, make it possible to identify innovative policies and institutions in specific areas that might offer lessons applicable to other parts of the Arctic. Likewise, the report will aim at providing an assessment of human development and quality of life that the Arctic Council's Sustainable Development Working Group (SDWG) can use to identify priorities. Finally she mentioned that one of the report's main objectives is to contribute to our knowledge and understanding of the interplay of physical and social processes of global change and their consequences for human living conditions and adaptability.

The guiding questions of the AHDR-II are as follows:

- How does the Arctic differ from the outside world and especially from the metropolises or heartlands of the Arctic states?
- How do indigeneity, ethnicity, geography, age, and gender affect perceptions of changes in the Arctic in connection with the management of natural resources?
- What are the impacts of climate and environmental change on resource governance?
- How much variance is there from one part of the Arctic to another in terms of your topic?
- What are the major trends unfolding at this time in relation to your topic?
- What are the main regional processes and global connections that are relevant to your topic?
- In the ten years since the AHDR (2004), what have been the main changes in terms of your topic?

One section of the report will examine Arctic populations and migration. It will focus on total population change, population change from natural increase and net migration, fertility and mortality trends, changing gender composition, and changes in age composition as well as changes in ethnic composition, migration, and Arctic populations of the future. Another focus of the report is on "Cultures and Identities." Here the emphasis will be on the historical background of circumpolar cultures and identities, Arctic culture, selected aspects of Northern cultures, cultural vitality and "culture loss," and circumpolar identities. The report will also characterize past, present, and future trends and analyze what has changed since the AHDR-I was put together. Political systems and global governance will be addressed in the report, also including what has changed since AHDR-I. Local Arctic governance, regional governance bodies, strategic partnerships, and the external geopolitics of the Arctic will also be examined. Moreover, the important issue of the new geopolitics of Arctic oil, gas, and natural resources, as well as the emerging Arctic

maritime politics, the multi-actor security approach, indigenous governance, and the future of Arctic cooperation will be studied thoroughly.

Larsen said that globalization will be a new chapter in the report and was not addressed in the earlier one. Globalization as a concept and its potential impacts on the Arctic will be examined, as well as economic, political, cultural, and social globalization. Larsen ended by saying that the report will address a broad audience because the fate of the Arctic is in the hands of the public and policymakers, including those outside the region. The inhabitants of the Arctic do not live in isolation and that is reflected in the report.

The fifth and final speaker was *Dr. David Hik*, President of the International Arctic Science Committee (IASC). Dr. Hik began his talk by giving a short introduction to the IASC, a non-governmental, international scientific organization established in 1990 by the eight Arctic countries, which promotes and supports leading-edge multidisciplinary research to foster a greater scientific understanding of the Arctic region and its role in the earth system. Dr. Hik discussed (among other things) the influence of the 2007-2008 International Polar Year (IPY), an internationally coordinated campaign of research intended to initiate a new era in polar science. The campaign consisted of 228 projects, with 50,000 participants from 63 nations. The results are still being compiled and communicated. Three conferences have been held to discuss the results of the campaign, and a summary report of early scientific results was published in 2011. Dr. Hik noted that the IPY had left a scientific, collaborative, and human legacy, comprised of:

- observational systems and networks, technologies and baseline data sets;
- enhanced cooperation, joint funding and information sharing;
- training of the next generation of researchers, the involvement of Arctic residents, and increased public awareness and interest.

In his view, research in the Arctic region is uniquely positioned to lead new earth system sustainability programs, by:

- sustaining interdisciplinary observational networks;
- ensuring data preservation, exchange, availability and effective use;
- creating better models for predicting future climates;
- facilitating active and equal engagement of indigenous people;
- engaging the next generation of scientists;
- strengthening partnerships with main stakeholders;
- integrating education and outreach.

With regard to observation systems Dr. Hik stressed the need to develop, enhance and integrate the systems needed to manage global and regional environmental change. In that regard he discussed the “Sustaining Arctic Observing Networks” (SAON) project, whose goal is to enhance Arctic-wide observing activities by facilitating partnerships and synergies among existing observing and data networks, and promoting the sharing and synthesis of data and information. Dr. Hik noted that SAON addresses the need to sustain and enhance our collective capacity to acquire, retain and use knowledge, with an emphasis on ensuring the inclusion of community-based monitoring and local/traditional knowledge activities, in collaboration with indigenous people’s organizations in the Arctic.

Dr. Hik also discussed the need to determine how to anticipate, recognize, avoid, and manage disruptive global environmental change, with continental glacier melt likely to be the dominant contributor to sea level rise in the next century. He furthermore discussed the need to determine how institutional, economic, and behavioral changes can enable effective steps towards global sustainability, and the importance of encouraging innovation in developing technological, policy, and social responses to achieve global sustainability. He also stressed the need for the closer integration of the natural and social sciences. Lastly, Dr. Hik expressed his view on the need to

develop something different than additional IPY campaigns; for instance, a “polar decade” had been proposed. Dr. Hik proposed a new framework, a sustained “International Polar Initiative,” that would:

- address the emerging challenges identified within the IPY;
- optimize and better coordinate existing resources and facilities;
- develop mechanisms for concerted investments in areas where activities were lacking;
- deliver better, more reliable scientific information for risk management, policy-making, and other relevant societal activities in the polar regions.

Dr. Hik pointed out that the new framework was currently under development and could be found on the IASC’s website. The IASC was looking to implement the framework in approximately 5 years, and very much welcomed any feedback or comments.

Statements, Questions and Comments

Mr. Kharuchi recommended joint resource management shared between government agencies and various resource users in the Arctic, including indigenous peoples. The approach depended on two processes: governmental management and aboriginal or traditional management. He noted that Russia had good experience of this approach, and stressed that it was important to delegate considerable powers to indigenous peoples when it came to resource management.

Ms. Mirja Vehkaperä, Member of the Finnish Parliament, called attention to the challenges small nations face when big companies exploit their land and then leave, with the state having to deal with any mess left behind.

Ms. Maria Stenberg, Member of the Swedish Parliament, called attention to the standard of living for people in the region, especially women, with young people moving away. She welcomed that fact that gender issues were included in the conference statement.

Ms. Olsvig agreed with Ms. Stenberg on the importance of gender issues and encouraged social scientists to focus more on this topic in their research. She discussed the debate about foreign workers in Greenland, including the issues of how Greenland could protect the rights of its own workers and how far it should go in regulating foreign workers. She stressed the importance of transparency when it came to issues like these. She finally noted how language issues could also become a challenge, given that most reports by industry are in English, a language in which the Greenlandic population has limited proficiency.

Mr. Bevington noted that resource development had taken note of sustainability for a long time. Now, however, it needed to go a bit further, with governments insisting on careful resource management and best practices. Further research on this would be needed.

Ms. Nymand-Larsen noted that the Stefánsson Arctic Institute would be focusing on co-management in the Arctic, as well as local and traditional knowledge. In the new human development report there would be a focus on how industrial development corresponds with human development, using among other things the social indicators mentioned in her presentation. The growing trend of female departure from the North

would also be a feature in the report, in the population and migration section.

Adoption of Conference Statement

Mr. Høglund introduced the Conference statement on behalf of the drafting committee. He expressed his satisfaction with the statement and his hope that fellow participants would agree. He noted that the statement touched on very relevant issues, and would serve as input to the Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting in Kiruna in 2013 and also to other processes. He highlighted a few of the recommendations in the statement, including those on creating a future vision for the Arctic Council, ecosystems, gender issues, establishing a chamber of commerce or economic forum, biodiversity, local and traditional knowledge, strengthening indigenous people’s educational institutions, supporting a second human development report, a polar decade initiative, and an annual conference of Arctic parliamentarians. Mr. Høglund then put the statement forth for adoption, with no objections. He then gave the floor to Mr. Miller, who thanked the organizers for an exceptional conference. He then invited participants to the 11th Conference of Arctic Parliamentarians in Canada in 2014. Mr. Høglund accepted the invitation on behalf of the Conference. He thanked the participants for a good meeting, the hosts for organizing the conference, and lastly the interpreters, technicians and others who made the event possible.



Members of SCPAR and their advisors.

Side Event: Arctic Council Breakfast Seminar

Around 45 people attended the Arctic Council breakfast seminar on September 6 at the 10th Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region in Akureyri, Iceland. The audience consisted of Parliamentarians from the Arctic region, Members of Parliament, senators, as well as some guests from outside the Arctic region.

The speakers at the event were Gustaf Lind, Arctic Council Senior Arctic Official Chair, Tom Barry, Executive Secretary of the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) working group and Soffia Guðmundsdóttir, Executive Secretary of the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME) working group. These speakers held presentations which were followed by brief individual speeches by the Finnish and Icelandic Senior Arctic Officials (SAOs) Hannu Halinen and Hjalmar W. Hannesson.

During the question and answer session after the presentations the audience asked a broad range of different questions. Some of the questions included what kind of Arctic Council assessments will be done in the future, how weather is incorporated into assessments, topics related to Arctic shipping and the Arctic Council observer issue.



Participants at the Arctic Council breakfast seminar.

Conference Statement

We, the elected representatives of Canada, Denmark/Greenland, the European Parliament, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden and the United States of America;

In collaboration with the indigenous peoples of the Arctic;

Meeting to discuss Arctic governance, responsible economic development in the Arctic and human development in the Arctic;

Considering the rapid change now occurring in the Arctic driven by the forces of climate change and globalization resulting in closer economic and geopolitical links;

Ask the governments in the Arctic Region, the Arctic Council and the institutions of the European Union, where appropriate;

Regarding Arctic Governance and the Arctic Council to

1. Initiate discussions toward developing the Arctic Council into a formal international organization by adopting an exclusive treaty among the eight Arctic states to give themselves more binding powers.
2. Hold annual Arctic Council ministerial meetings, as well as regular meetings between ministers responsible for special sectors important to Arctic cooperation, such as research and education and environmental issues.
3. Establish the permanent secretariat of the Arctic Council with personnel reflecting the member states, including indigenous communities.
4. Establish an adequate and stable budget to support the work of the Arctic Council.
5. Create a vision for the Arctic on how the Arctic nations can prepare for new opportunities and challenges as a result of a changing Arctic and, as part of this process, hold an Arctic Summit involving heads of state and government of the Arctic Council member states, as well as

the heads of the Permanent Participants.

6. Encourage Canada and the US to identify joint priorities for their consecutive chairmanships of the Arctic Council.
7. Secure the role and participation of the Permanent Participants and provide mechanisms to increase their financial and human resources to participate fully in all the activities of the Arctic Council.
8. Explore new ways to include the views of the Permanent Participants in future legal agreements between the Arctic nations.
9. Ensure an open and consultative process by including the Arctic communities, permanent participants, scientists, the business community and others, in the development of a visionary Kiruna statement to be adopted at the Ministerial Meeting in May 2013.
10. Explore new areas for legally binding agreements between the Arctic countries in possible areas such as research, education, tourism and aspects of environmental protection. When appropriate, the agreements may open to interested parties.
11. Produce good practice examples of environmental action and governance that other parts of the world can replicate and learn from.
12. Identify and agree on environmental indicators that can be used to tackle accelerated change in the Arctic and can also feed into the process of developing global sustainable development goals (SDGs).
13. Encourage a close collaboration between the Arctic Council and the Barents Euro-Arctic Council (BEAC) in all areas of common interest and concern.
14. Agree on observer status of interested parties to secure the Arctic Council as the primary forum for Arctic cooperation.

Regarding Economic Opportunities in the Arctic to

15. Recognize ecosystems and science as fundamental, principal considerations in Arctic resource management.
16. Ensure that gender based analyses are used in the development, implementation and assessment of all Arctic policies.
17. Ask the Arctic Council member states to intensify their cooperation in the International Maritime Organization in order to speed up the work on a mandatory Polar Code for shipping, and intensify their cooperation on hydrographic data collection.
18. Efficiently implement the agreement on search and rescue cooperation in the Arctic and, in this respect, also conduct joint search and rescue exercises in cooperation with those countries whose vessels cross Arctic routes.
19. Increase sub-regional cooperation and coordination in the development of new transport strategies, and give the Arctic a prominent role in the implementation of the Northern Dimension Partnership on Logistics and Transportation.
20. Establish an Arctic Chamber of Commerce or Economic Forum that includes, amongst others, local communities and indigenous peoples of the Arctic.
21. Support capacity building, particularly through education, in order that local communities will benefit more from economic development.
22. Support cross-border and trans-border economic and human cooperation in the Arctic Region, and consider how to strengthen the possibilities for travelling east-west and how to develop infrastructure for data-communications and satellite surveillance of cruise ships and other vessels in the Arctic.
23. Stimulate environmental innovation in leading sectors and focus on producing examples of good practices.
24. Develop overall strategies for assessing environmental, social and cultural consequences when exploiting natural resources in the Arctic, to ensure that

any such exploitation is based on principles of sustainability.

25. Include strategies for mitigative action and adaptation to climate change as well as environmental effects in all analyses of economic development in the North.
26. Support continued close cooperation between the research community and other Arctic stakeholders.
27. Identify particularly vulnerable Arctic areas that require special management to secure biodiversity.
28. Prevent oil spills and finalize the oil spill preparedness and response agreement between the Arctic states.
29. Develop renewable energy suitable for the Arctic region and develop leading technologies in terms of society and environment.
30. Initiate joint research on challenges related to oil drilling and transportation of oil and other hazardous goods in Arctic waters in order to improve capacity in the event of oil spills and other environmental accidents.

Regarding Enhancing Human Development in the Arctic to

31. Develop the Arctic region with the human dimension in focus and with a human rights approach.
32. Analyze the knowledge gaps in Arctic social sciences and research, and enhance cross-border knowledge sharing and building.
33. Consider the impacts of bans of products of some living resources on indigenous Arctic communities.
34. Encourage the European Union to speed up its work on the creation of a European Arctic Information Centre as a network with a hub at the Arctic Centre of the University of Lapland, Finland, cooperating with relevant research institutions.
35. Strengthen and expand mobility and exchange programs involving students in the Arctic.
36. Establish an Arctic Council framework mentorship and mobility program, in

- cooperation with universities and scientific and business communities.
37. Continue the inclusion and recognition of traditional and local knowledge, and improve the interplay and complementary relationship between traditional knowledge and conventional science.
 38. Strengthen the indigenous peoples' educational institutions by building competence locally in the Arctic including their own holistic knowledge.
 39. Disseminate the rich knowledge accumulated during the International Polar Year and follow up on the IPY 2012 theme "From Knowledge to Action."
 40. Anchor knowledge accumulated from Arctic research in the Arctic and secure local capacity building in education, research, policy making and local governance.
 41. Support and increase the use of indigenous and community-based monitoring of living resources.
 42. Continue the focus on human health and well-being, with an emphasis on mental health, prevention and food safety among Arctic peoples.
 43. Continue to strengthen cooperation between the University of the Arctic and the indigenous peoples' organizations.
 44. Develop a more structured partnership with the University of the Arctic, the International Arctic Science Committee, International Arctic Social Sciences Association and other relevant organizations.

45. Support the second Arctic Human Development Report and the plans for an International Polar Decade initiative.

Ask the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region to

46. Strengthen the dialogue with the Arctic Council in the process of drafting a statement at the next Ministerial Meeting in Kiruna 2013.
47. Start to explore the possibility of annual Conferences of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region.
48. Promote the Statement from the Tenth Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region in the further development of Arctic policy in the Arctic states and the European Union and involve all the member parliaments in this process.

Furthermore the Conference

49. Acknowledges the interest and presence of parliamentary observers and representatives from governments and non-government agencies at this Conference, and recognizes their important role in relaying the messages and supporting the actions herein discussed.
50. Welcomes the forthcoming Canadian chairmanship of the Arctic Council and looks forward to continued cooperation with the Arctic Council.
51. Welcomes and accepts the kind invitation of the Parliament of Canada to host the Eleventh Conference in 2014.

Program

5 September

- 10.30 Meeting of the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region (SCPAR). Venue: Hamrar, Hof
- 11.30 Meeting of SCPAR and Observers of the Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region (CPAR). Venue: Hamrar, Hof
- 14.00 Opening of the Conference. Venue: Hamraborg, Hof
Co-Chairs: Ms Guðfríður Lilja Grétarsdóttir, MP, Iceland
Mr Morten Høglund, MP, Norway

- H.E. Ms Ásta R. Jóhannsdóttir, Speaker of Alþingi, the Icelandic Parliament
- Ms Guðfríður Lilja Grétarsdóttir, Vice-Chair of SCPAR and Head of Delegation, Iceland
- Mr Eiríkur Björn Björgvinsson, Mayor of Akureyri

Opening statement

- Dr Össur Skarphéðinsson, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Iceland

Reports on activities:

- Mr Gustaf Lind, Senior Arctic Official Chair, Sweden
- Mr Morten Høglund, Chair of SCPAR, Norway

Special greetings:

- Senator Vladimir Torlopov, Head of Delegation, Council of Federation, Russia
 - followed by an exchange of views

15.30 Coffee break

16.00 1st session: **Arctic Governance and the Arctic Council**. Venue: Hamraborg, Hof
Co-Chairs: Senator Lisa Murkowski, US Senate
Mr Pat de Cope Gallagher, MEP, European Parliament

- Mr Clifford Lincoln, former MP and former Chair of SCPAR, Canada
- Ms Ann-Kristin Johansson, MP, Sweden
- Dr Valur Ingimundarson, Professor, University of Iceland
 - followed by an exchange of views

18.00 Meeting of Drafting Committee. Venue: Dynheimar, Hof

19.00 Welcoming Reception hosted by the Icelandic Delegation. Venue: Naust, Hof

6 September

- 08.00 Meeting of Drafting Committee. Venue: Dynheimar, Hof
- 08.00 Side Event: Arctic Council Breakfast Seminar. Venue: Hamrar, Hof
- 09.00 2nd session: **Economic Opportunities in the Arctic**. Venue: Hamraborg, Hof
Co-Chairs: Mr Larry Miller, MP, Canada
Ms Ann-Kristin Johansson, MP, Sweden
- Senator Lisa Murkowski, US Senate
 - Ms Johanna Ojala-Niemelä, MP, Finland
 - Mr Michael Slipenchuk, MP, Russia
 - Mr Tero Vauraste, President and CEO of Arctia Shipping Ltd.
 - Mr Felix Tschudi, Chairman of Tschudi Shipping Co.
 - followed by an exchange of views
- 10.15 Coffee Break
- 10.35 Continuation of 2nd session
- 12.00 Lunch. Venue: Naust, Hof
- 13.15 Excursion and Dinner hosted by the Head of the Icelandic Delegation, Guðfríður Lilja Grétarsdóttir. Bus transport from Hotel KEA and Icelandair Hotel

7 September

- 08.00 Meeting of Drafting Committee. Venue: Dynheimar, Hof
- 09.00 3rd session: **Human Development in the Arctic: Interplay of Research, Authorities and Residents**. Venue: Hamraborg, Hof
Co-Chairs: Senator Vladimir Torlopov, Council of Federation, Russia
Ms Johanna Ojala-Niemelä, MP, Finland
- Ms Sara Olsvig, MP, Denmark/Greenland
 - Mr Larry Miller and Mr Dennis Bevington, MPs, Canada
 - Dr Joan Nymand-Larsen, Senior Scientist, Stefansson Arctic Institute
 - Dr David Hik, President of the International Arctic Science Committee (IASC)
 - followed by an exchange of views
- 10.15 Coffee break
- 10.35 Continuation of 3rd session
- 12.00 Adoption of the Conference Statement
- Announcement of the 11th Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region in 2014
 - Closing of the Conference

List of Participants

- Ms Yasmin Ali, Assistant Director, Americas Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Singapore.
- Ms Ragnheiður E. Árnadóttir, MP, Parliament of Iceland.
- Mr Jóhann Ásmundsson, Program Officer, CAFF - Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna.
- Ms Arna G. Bang, Advisor, Parliament of Iceland.
- Mr Tom Barry, Executive Secretary, CAFF - Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna.
- Mr Dennis Bevington, MP, Parliament of Canada - House of Commons.
- Mr Eiríkur Björn Björgvinsson, Mayor of Akureyri, Iceland.
- Ms Elisabeth Björnsdóttir Rahm, MP, Parliament of Sweden.
- Mr Alan Bones, Ambassador, Canada.
- Ms Anita Brodén, MP, Parliament of Sweden.
- Mr Sheng Wei Ethan Chua, Deputy Director, Europe Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Singapore.
- Mr Nikolay Dankov, Consultant, Foreign Affairs Department, Federation Council, Russian Council of Federation.
- Mr Percy Downe, Senator, Head of Delegation, Parliament of Canada - Senate.
- Mr Isaac Edwards, Advisor, United States Congress - Senate.
- Ms Björg Eva Erlendsdóttir, Advisor, Left-wing Socialist Green Group, Nordic Council.
- Ms Freyja Dögg Frímansdóttir, Project Manager, Hof, Iceland.
- Mr Pat the Cope Gallagher, MEP, European Parliament.
- Mr Dominic Goh, Director General, Europe Directorate, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Singapore.
- Ms Guðfríður Lilja Grétarsdóttir, Vice-Chair of SCPAR, Head of Delegation, MP, Parliament of Iceland.
- Ms Soffía Guðmundsdóttir, Executive Secretary, PAME - Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment.
- Ms Jónína Rós Guðmundsdóttir, MP, Parliament of Iceland.
- Ms Halla Gunnarsdóttir, Political Advisor, Ministry of the Interior, Iceland.
- Mr Hallur Gunnarsson, Data Manager, CAFF - Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna.
- Mr Hannu Halinen, Ambassador, Arctic Affairs, Finland.
- Mr Hjálmar W. Hannesson, Ambassador, Iceland.
- Mr Geir-Ketil Hansen, MP, Parliament of Norway.
- Ms Yelena Sesselja Helgadóttir, Interpreter, Parliament of Iceland.
- Ms Elizabeth Saagulik Hensley, Public Policy Liaison to the NANA Regional Corporation of Alaska.
- Dr David Hik, Professor, University of Alberta, President of the International Arctic Science Committee - IASC.
- Ms Eva Hjelm, International Advisor, Parliament of Sweden.
- Mr Helgi Hjörvar, MP, Nordic Council.
- Mr Dag Wernø Holter, Ambassador to Iceland, Norway.
- Mr Morten Høglund, Chair of SCPAR, MP, Parliament of Norway.
- Dr Jón Haukur Ingimundarson, Senior Scientist, Stefansson Arctic Institute.
- Dr Valur Ingimundarson, Professor, University of Iceland.
- Ms Ann-Kristine Johansson, MP, Parliament of Sweden.
- Mr Johan Johansson, MP, Parliament of Sweden.
- H.E. Ms Ásta R. Jóhannesdóttir, Speaker of Alþingi, Parliament of Iceland.
- Mr Halldór Jóhannsson, Director, Arctic Portal.
- Mr Kristján Þór Júlíusson, MP, Parliament of Iceland.
- Mr Robert Kadas, Foreign Policy Advisor, Circumpolar Affairs, Canada.
- Mr Boris Kashin, MP, Russian State Duma.
- Mr Dan Katz, Political Officer, United States of America.
- Mr Sergey Kharuchi, President of Russian Arctic Indigenous Peoples of the North - RAIPON, Chair of Yamal regional Parliament, MP.
- Ms Silje Bergum Kinsten, International Adviser, Parliament of Norway.
- Mr Ivar Kristiansen, MP, Parliament of Norway.
- Mr Lars Kullerud, President, University of the Arctic, International Secretariat.
- Mr Alexander Kurdyumov, MP, Russian State Duma.
- Ms Irina Kuzmina, Secretary, Russian State Duma.
- Mr Mika Laaksonen, Secretary for International Affairs, Parliament of Finland.
- Mr Kári Fannar Lárusson, Program Officer, CAFF - Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna.
- Ms Helena Leander, MP, Parliament of Sweden.
- Mr Clifford Lincoln, former MP and former Chair of SCPAR, Canada.
- Mr Gustaf Lind, Ambassador, Arctic Council.

Mr Guy Lindström, Deputy Director of International Department, Parliament of Finland.

Mr Þorsteinn Magnússon, Assistant Secretary General, Parliament of Iceland.

Mr Kirill Mangush, Counsellor, Foreign Affairs Department Federation Council, Russian Council of Federation.

Mr Andrei Melnikov, Second Secretary, Embassy of Russia in Iceland.

Mr Riccardo Migliori, President of OSCE Parliamentary Assembly, MP, Parliament of Italy.

Mr Larry Miller, MP, Parliament of Canada - House of Commons.

Ms Silvia Modig, MP, Nordic Council.

Ms Lisa Murkowski, Senator, United States Congress - Senate.

Mr Kjell Myhre-Jensen, Head of Section, Parliament of Norway.

Dr Joan Nymand Larsen, Senior Scientist, Stefansson Arctic Institute.

Ms Embla Eir Oddsdóttir, Project Manager, Stefansson Arctic Institute.

Ms Johanna Ojala-Niemelä, MP, Parliament of Finland.

Ms Ingalill Olsen, MP, Parliament of Norway.

Ms Sara Olsvig, MP, Parliament of Denmark.

Ms Olga Pálsdóttir, Executive Assistant, CAFF - Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna.

Mr Peder H. Pedersen, Senior Advisor, Parliament of Denmark.

Ms Courtney Price, Communications Officer, CAFF - Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna.

Ms Elisabeth Riddell-Dixon, Western University.

Mr Bjørn Willy Robstad, Secretary General, SCPAR.

Ms Nancy Ruth, Senator, Parliament of Canada - Senate.

Mr Pór Saari, MP, West-Nordic Council.

Mr Vasiliy Shambir, Speaker, Parliamentary Association of the North-West of Russia - PANWR.

Mr Kemal Siddique, Ambassador, Special Envoy for Arctic Affairs, Singapore.

Mr Stefán B. Sigurðsson, Rector, University of Akureyri.

Mr Eirik Sivertsen, MP, Parliament of Norway.

Dr Össur Skarphéðinsson, Minister for Foreign Affairs, Iceland.

Mr Henning Skumsvoll, MP, Parliament of Norway.

Mr Mikhail Slipenchuk, MP, Russian State Duma.

Mr Stanislav R. Smirnov, Interpreter, Parliament of Iceland.

Mr Stígur Stefánsson, Head of Department, Parliament of Iceland.

Ms Maria Stenberg, MP, Parliament of Sweden.

Mr Søren Bo Søndergaard, MEP, European Parliament.

Mr Finn Sørensen, MP, Parliament of Denmark.

Mr Torkil Sørensen, International Advisor, Nordic Council.

Mr Sam Tan, Senior Parliamentary Secretary, Foreign Affairs and Community Development, Youth & Sports, Singapore.

Mr Kungla Tarvo, Administrator, European Parliament.

Ms Magdalena Tomasik, Project Manager, Arctic Portal.

Mr Vladimir Torlopov, Senator, Russian Council of Federation.

Mr Felix Tschudi, Chairman, Tschudi Shipping Co.

Mr Fedot Tumusov, MP, Russian State Duma.

Mr Lárus Valgarðsson, Advisor, Parliament of Iceland.

Mr Einar Karl Valmundsson, Technical Manager, Hof, Iceland.

Mr Tero Vauraste, President and CEO, Arctia Shipping Ltd.

Ms Mirja Vehkaperä, MP, Parliament of Finland.

Ms Leena Viitanen, Deputy Director, Arctic Portal.

Mr Sampo Villanen, Assistant, Parliament of Finland.

Mr Timothy Williams, Analyst for the Canadian Delegation, Parliament of Canada.

Mr Zhe Zhang, Bureau Chief, China Radio International.

Mr Höskuldur Þórhallsson, MP, Parliament of Iceland.