

Canada - Europe
Parliamentary Association



Association parlementaire
Canada - Europe

**Report of the Canadian Parliamentary Delegation
respecting its participation at the Standing Committee of
Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region**

Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association

**Helsinki, Finland
November 18-19, 2009**

Report

INTRODUCTION

Dean Allison, M.P., led a Canadian delegation of two to the meeting of the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region (the Standing Committee) held in Helsinki, Finland, 18 and 19 November 2009. The other delegate was Mr. Massimo Pacetti, M.P. Accompanying the delegation was Mr. Tim Williams from the Parliamentary Information and Research Service of the Library of Parliament as advisor to the delegation.

The Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region is a parliamentary body comprising delegations appointed by the national parliaments of the Arctic states (Canada, Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Russia, Sweden, the United States of America) and the European Parliament. The conference also includes Permanent Participants representing Indigenous peoples, as well as observers. The conference meets every two years. The Eighth Conference was held in Fairbanks, Alaska, U.S.A., 12-14 August 2008.¹

Between conferences, Arctic parliamentary cooperation is carried on by the Standing Committee, which started its activities in 1994. The Conference and Standing Committee take initiatives to further Arctic cooperation, and act, in particular, as a parliamentary forum for issues relevant to the work of the Arctic Council. The Standing Committee takes part in the work of the Council as an observer.²

MEETING SUMMARY

The meeting of the Standing Committee was preceded by a workshop, held on the 18 November, dedicated to a discussion of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS). Much of the focus was on Article 76 of Part VI (Continental Shelf), the definition of the continental shelf, and its implications. The relative merits of the environmental protection provided for by UNCLOS were also discussed.

The Workshop on UNCLOS

The chair, Mr. Hannes Manninen, MP (Finland), opened the workshop by noting that the members of the Standing Committee have historically shown a great deal of interest in the legal regime applicable to Arctic governance³ and the role of UNCLOS and other international agreements in Arctic environmental protection. It was noted that the United States was likely to take up debate on ratifying UNLCOS in the near future. He stated that discussion regarding Arctic governance should not create divisions between coastal and non-coastal Arctic states.

¹ The Conference report is available at: <http://www.arcticparl.org/announcements.aspx?id=3319>

² Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, <http://www.arcticparl.org/>

³ See, Statement of the 8th Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, 12-14 August 2008, par. 32, <http://www.arcticparl.org/res/site/file/ConferencstatementFinal.doc> and; Statement of the 7th Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, 2-4 August 2006, par. 20, 28, 29, http://www.arcticparl.org/res/site/File/static/conf7_conference_statement_final_draft.pdf

Kamrul Hussein, University of Lapland, introduced the topic of UNCLOS and the definition of the continental shelf.⁴ Mr Hussein gave an account of the history of UNCLOS and the continental shelf before giving a detailed description of the criteria that constrain what nations can claim as continental shelf. Essentially the continental shelf is defined by either:

- The position where the thickness of the sedimentary rock is 1% of the distance from that point to the foot of the continental slope, or
- The point 60 nautical miles from the foot of the continental slope.

The foot of the continental slope is determined by the point of maximum change in the gradient at its base. Further to this the shelf cannot exceed:

- 350 nautical miles from the baselines defining the land, or
- 100 nautical miles from the 2500 metre isobath (a line connecting all points where the ocean floor is 2500 m below the surface).

Other presenters made it clear that most of the Arctic claims will be based on the 2500 m isobar criterion.

To support submissions, countries must compile considerable amounts of geological data. These include:

- Bathymetric (water-depth) data to delineate the foot of the continental slope and the 2500 meters isobaths;
- Seismic reflection and refraction data to determine the thickness of sedimentary rocks; and
- Magnetic and gravity field data when needed to support other data.

The claim is then sent to the Commission on the outer Limits of the Continental Shelf and this must happen by ten years after UNCLOS comes into force for that country. The Commission makes recommendations on the outer limit of the continental shelf and, if the outer limit is determined on the basis of the recommendations, the delineation will be final and binding.

In the case of a country disagreeing with the Commission, the Commission may ask the country to resubmit. The speaker gave an account of the December 2001 submission of the Russian Federation. In June 2002, the commission declared it neither accepts nor rejects the Russian claim. The Commission asked Russia to resubmit with further scientific data which Russia plans to do with an answer expected by 2010.

Canada, Denmark, Japan, Norway and the United States all submitted objections to the Commission regarding the Russian submission. Canada's objection was not for or against the claim but a statement that it was not in a position to decide whether it agrees or not make a without the provision of further supporting data to analyse. Canada also noted that any recommendations by the Commission in response to

⁴ The Workshop presentations are available at: Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, *Announcements, Presentations from the Helsinki meeting November 2009*, <http://www.arcticparl.org/announcements.aspx?id=3988>

Russian submission are without prejudice to the question of delimiting the continental shelf between Canada and the Russian Federation.

Other countries had similar objections but the United States was more specific, making legal and scientific arguments that contradicted the Russian claim. The United States does not agree with the manner by which the Russian Federation has marked its territory (land) using baselines, an element over which the Commission has no jurisdiction. In addition, the US does not believe that the Russian claims regarding ridges have a scientific basis. It believes that the Alpha-Mendeleev Ridge System is not a submerged prolongation of the land mass of Russia and that the Lomonosov Ridge is not a natural component of the continental margins of either Russia or any other state. This point lead into a detailed description of the treatment of ridges by UNLCOS, aspects of which were not applied by Russia in its submission, in particular Article 76(6).

Norway also has a boundary dispute with Russia over part of the continental shelf known as the Loop Hole. Since there is no question of whether or not the area is continental shelf, Norway also stated that the Russian claim was without prejudice to the delimitation of the continental shelf between itself and Russia. Norway made its claim in 2006 and accepted the recommendations of the Commission, but the Loop Hole remains a bilateral dispute between Russia and Norway.

Harald Brekke, Member of the Commission on the Limits of the Continental Shelf, then discussed some aspects of Arctic geology and the work of the Commission. Defining the continental shelf fundamentally is about identifying continental versus oceanic crust. Continental crust is roughly a billion years old while oceanic crust is much younger, the oldest being 250 million years old. Defining where one starts and the other ends is very difficult so that UNCLOS uses very simplified rules (see above).

There are some gaps in our understanding of the formation of the Arctic Ocean basin system. There are in fact two major basins in the Arctic Ocean, the Amerasian Basin (toward Canada) and the Eurasian (toward Norway). The tectonic forces that formed the Amerasian Basin in particular remain a mystery. This basin was formed somewhere between 135 and 110 million years ago. The major current geological fault that runs between Russia and Greenland opened up around 110 million years ago, along the continental shelf on the Russian and Norway side of the Amerasian basin. The fault runs somewhat parallel to the Amerasian Basin and so, as the fault opened up, a ridge of remnant continental shelf was left that separates the two basins, the Lomonosov Ridge.

Few countries have the capacity to collect all of the necessary data (as described above) by themselves, particularly considering that data must be obtained from 4000m below ice. Scientific cooperation between the Arctic coastal states as well as other interested countries has been a hallmark of assessments of the geology of the Arctic Ocean.

Data are then submitted to the Commission for its consideration and recommendations. The Commission members are elected by the Meeting of States Parties to the Convention and all are experts in the field of geology, geophysics or hydrography. It consists of 21 members but operates by sub-commissions of 7 members.

Mr. Brekke noted that in the Ilulissat Declaration the five coastal Arctic States declared that they remain committed to the UNCLOS framework and to the orderly settlement of any possible overlapping claims. Of the five Arctic coastal states, two have made submissions and three have not:

- Russian Federation: Submitted 20/12/01, recommendation made 28/06/02
- Norway: Submitted 26/11/06, recommendation made 27/03/09
- Canada: Submission must be made by 07/11/13
- Denmark with Greenland: Submission must be made by 16/11/14
- USA: Has not ratified UNCLOS.

Outside of the Arctic, the Commission has received 50 submissions, of which 13 have been opened. It was pointed out that a number of these submissions have been made by more than one country. The Bay of Biscay area, for example, was a joint submission by Ireland, the United Kingdom, France and Spain, for which recommendations were made on 26 March 2009.

Lars Kullerud, President of the University of the Arctic, then discussed some of the implications of applying under UNCLOS for an extended continental shelf. Despite much talk of oil and gas, these resources are found on the true geological continental shelf, and these areas are already within the jurisdiction of one or other of the Arctic coastal states Exclusive Economic Zone (200 nautical miles). Though there are bilateral disputes regarding some areas of continental shelf, this does not involve Article 76 of UNCLOS. The question of the extended continental shelf, therefore, does not impact on states' rights to conventional fossil fuel sources.

There are other resources that may be found in the extended continental shelf areas. One of the most important is methane hydrates. Essentially these are bubbles of methane trapped in ice and these could be an immense non-conventional fossil fuel resource. It was noted that Japan is in a relatively advanced stage of exploiting this resource.⁵ Other possible resources include biological resources, diamonds and metals. As a consequence of the potential for resources, careful stewardship will be required.

Dr. Kullerud emphasized that there is a new map of the world being created. In the Arctic, an area the size of Russia and Australia will be under new governance based on the UNCLOS framework. He also noted, however, that article 76 of UNCLOS only covers the sea floor and not the column of water over it or the surface of the ice, leaving a gap in governance under UNCLOS.

Following this presentation, Dr. Tatiana Saksina of the WWF spoke to the need for filling in the framework of UNCLOS with domestic regulations and regional governance regimes in order to achieve its purposes. In her opinion, UNCLOS contains only minimal rules for the protection of the environment, however, this was not a flaw in the Convention, but wording intended to move countries to implement similar regional protection measures for a common environment.

⁵ See for instance: Leo Lewis, "Japan's Arctic methane hydrate haul raises environment fears," *The Times Online*, 14, April 2008, <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article3740036.ece>

According to Dr. Saksina, the Arctic environment is in danger because there is:

- An absence of modern regulatory tools, such as the precautionary approach;
- A lack of necessary tailor-made measures to protect the extremely fragile environment and ecosystems of the Arctic;
- No requirement of integrated, cross-sectoral ecosystem-based ocean management.

Her proposed solution is to set up agreement under the Regional Seas Programme of the United Nations Environment Programme.⁶ Dr. Saksina suggested that regional seas agreements contain modern comprehensive rules for the protection of the marine environment which take into account specific regional features and challenges as well as desires of coastal states.

There is no conflict between UNCLOS and the Regional Seas Programme. There are over 140 countries participating in 13 Regional Seas Programmes. Nearly all of the participating states in the Regional Seas Programme have claimed sovereignty over their marine resources under UNCLOS.⁷ In fact it was argued that such regional agreements are encouraged under Article 197 of UNCLOS which states:

Cooperation on a global or regional basis

States shall cooperate on a global basis and, as appropriate, on a regional basis, directly or through competent international organizations, in formulating and elaborating international rules, standards and recommended practices and procedures consistent with this Convention, for the protection and preservation of the marine environment, taking into account characteristic regional features.

Given this participation in the Regional Seas Programme and the needs of the Arctic, Dr. Saksina asked why the Arctic seems to be an exception in not being covered by a Regional Seas agreement.

Following the presentations, a delegate from Sweden began the discussion by asking for comments on a possible moratorium on exploration. In addition, the delegate pointed out that UNCLOS was only one convention and asked if the suite of conventions (including the UN Convention on Biological Diversity for instance) were adequate to protect life?

Dr. Kullerud thought that it was very important to look at all conventions, many of which could be useful to the Arctic, perhaps by adding, where useful, annexes specific to the Arctic. Kamrul Hussein noted however that the Ilulissat Declaration between the 5 Arctic coastal states seemed to make it politically impossible to use any other agreement than UNCLOS. It was later noted by Dr. Kullerud, however, that UNCLOS was just about the sea bed and not the water column above it.

Dr. Saksina stated that a moratorium was not part of the current discussion, but that new rules were required to guard the Arctic's fragile environment. She also noted that it

⁶ See United Nations Environment Programme, Regional Seas Programme, <http://www.unep.org/regionalseas/default.asp>

⁷ United Nations Environment Programme, Regional Seas Programme, "UNCLOS," <http://www.unep.org/regionalseas/partners/meas/UNCLOS/default.asp>

might be easier to get a regional agreement between the 5 coastal states than it would be to get 160 signatories to UNCLOS to agree on additional Arctic-specific protocols to UNCLOS as a whole.

A Finnish participant brought up the possibility of strengthening the legal base of the Arctic Council as a response to the issues facing the Arctic Ocean. The Danish Senior Arctic Official (Denmark currently has the chair of the Arctic Council) noted that the great strength of the Arctic Council was as a decision *shaping* forum, not a decision *making* one. She noted that, far from popular perception, there was no third world war going to be waged over the Arctic and that the Arctic Council was at the core of security for the region.

Dr. Kullerud also noted that the Arctic Council was a better tool than commonly thought. He was of the opinion that the Arctic coastal states might be a little defensive when it came to their sovereignty because of the suggestion made by some that what is needed is an Arctic equivalent of the Antarctic Treaty.

The Secretary General to the Standing Committee then brought up the question of how UNCLOS could be used to manage fish stocks. It was noted by Kamrul Hussein that there is an agreement on the management of fish stocks under UNLCOS.⁸ Dr. Saskina stated, however, that there was some good and some bad aspects to this agreement. It was noted that it is only for straddling stocks and migratory fish and that this left out some fish stocks.

The Meeting of the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, 19 November 2009

The current agenda and the minutes from the previous meeting of the Standing Committee (Ilulissat, Greenland, 27 May 2009) were approved.

UPDATE ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE DANISH CHAIRMANSHIP OF THE ARCTIC COUNCIL

Before describing the general direction of the Danish chairmanship, Ms. Mikaela Engell, the Danish Senior Arctic Official (SAO), began her presentation by summarizing the SAO meeting of 12-13 November 2009, which was the first under the Denmark/Greenland chairmanship.

Senior Arctic Official's Meeting, 12-13 November 2009

The most important issue was preparation for the 15th Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (CoP 15, the Copenhagen conference). The Arctic Council's Snow, Water, Ice and Permafrost in the Arctic (SWIPA) project was approved in 2008 and is due for completion in 2011. A preliminary report on the Greenland Ice Sheet (GRIS) in a Changing Climate, as part of SWIPA, was presented to the Arctic Council in 2009 at their April meeting in Tromsø, and it was decided in the declaration⁹ to present it at CoP 15. SAOs approved the GRIS and

⁸ The United Nations Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention_agreements/convention_overview_fish_stocks.htm

⁹ Arctic Council, Tromsø Declaration, <http://arctic-council.org/filearchive/Tromsoe%20Dedaration-1..pdf>

SWIPA products for public release to CoP15 in accordance with the Tromsø decision. The Arctic venue and Arctic side events at CoP 15 were also discussed.

The year 2010 has been declared by the United Nations to be the International Year of Biodiversity (IYB). The report *Global Biodiversity Outlook 3* (GBO 3), which is to be released during 2010, is the flagship publication of the Convention on Biological Diversity and will be an important vehicle for informing a variety of audiences of the importance of biodiversity and the progress made in meeting the 2010 Biodiversity Target.¹⁰ The Arctic Biodiversity Assessment is an Arctic Council project that will complete a full assessment in 2013, but will also produce a report entitled *Arctic Biodiversity Trends – 2010: selected indicators of change* as its contribution to the IYB and GBO 3. The key messages of the indicators report were presented and the SAOs approved a process by which to endorse the report to be submitted to the GBO 3.

The 2009 Arctic Council declaration also created two task Forces; Short-lived Climate Forcers (such as black carbon or soot), and Search and Rescue. The SAOs were given an update on the establishment of these task forces.

The Sustaining Arctic Observing Networks (SAON) has been of interest to the Standing Committee and received support as a legacy of the International Polar Year 2007 – 2009 in the Statement from the Eighth Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region.¹¹ The SAON Steering Group presented its decisions on initial priority actions, and described accomplishments to date to the SAOs, who made comments on these advances and agreed to work domestically to enhance government-wide support for the work of the steering group.

The Danish Chairmanship

Norway, Denmark and Sweden will be chairs of the Arctic Council for three consecutive sessions from 2006 to 2012 and agreed to a set of Common objectives and priorities for that term.¹² One of the concrete results of this agreement was the establishment of an Arctic Council Secretariat in Tromsø which is funded by Norway. Before this, there was no archive so that the secretariat acts as the first corporate memory for the Arctic Council. Ms. Engell expressed the wish that the secretariat would continue under the Canadian chairmanship following Sweden's tenure in 2012.

The most important focus of the Danish chairmanship is the “human dimension” of the Arctic. It was noted that Greenland hosted a seminar on suicide prevention and that it left attendees full of hope.

Another important aspect will be to make decisions on the official observers at the Council. The last SAO meeting had over 200 participants. In the past it was hard to get anyone to take notice. Though oblivious in the past, now many states, organization and

¹⁰ “In April 2002, the Parties to the Convention committed themselves to achieve by 2010 a significant reduction of the current rate of biodiversity loss at the global, regional and national level as a contribution to poverty alleviation and to the benefit of all life on Earth.” Convention on Biological Diversity, “2010 Biodiversity Target,” <http://www.cbd.int/2010-target/>

¹¹ Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, Conference Statement, paragraph 23, http://www.arcticparl.org/_res/site/file/ConferencstatementFinal.doc

¹² Arctic Council, *Common objectives and priorities for the Norwegian, Danish and Swedish chairmanships of the Arctic Council (2006-2012)*, http://arctic-council.org/filearchive/Formannskapsprogram_ArcticCouncil.pdf

non-governmental organizations are very interested in the Arctic. Despite this interest it is very important to maintain the core of the Arctic Council as the 8 Arctic states and 6 permanent participants and that this core should not be diminished by increased observers.

China, South Korea, Italy and the European Union Commission have all applied for observer status, however consensus is needed and, at Tromsø, consensus could not be reached.¹³ The Danish national position is that the Arctic Council is the only forum and that if it cannot accommodate observers it might encourage others to find different fora to involve themselves in the Arctic. This could dilute the power of the Arctic Council so they should be accommodated. That being said, the increased interest is also leading to logistical problems. The next meeting is to take place in Ilulissat, Greenland, and there is a limit of 170 people as a result of accommodation capacity. If the meetings are to continue to take place in the Arctic communities, as they should, this will continue to be a problem.

The governance model for the Arctic Council is also an issue. The clear intent is to adhere to the Ilulissat Declaration¹⁴ of the five Arctic states (and their wish to adhere to the legal framework of UNCLOS), but much work is to be done. The Arctic Council is respected for its many reports, including the major contribution of the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment. The working groups of the Council have produced many relevant assessments. The question is how they can be used to best advantage. One concept would be to compile a summary of "Megatrends in the Arctic" to help identify the overall drivers in the Arctic, possible gaps in knowledge, and the likely challenges and opportunities of Arctic societies over the next decades. This could also help give direction to the Arctic Council's future direction.

The Chair of the Standing Committee asked the speaker about the implementation of the agreement of the Council to hold meetings more than once every two years. The decision by the Council was taken after a strong intervention by the chair of the Standing Committee recommending that the Council meet every year to better manage rapidly changing Arctic issues.¹⁵ The Council decided that a meeting of deputy ministers should take place in years between full Council meetings.¹⁶

The first meeting of deputy ministers will take place in 2010. The meetings may be used as thematic discussions on specific issues. The Chair asked about the role and mandate of the deputy ministerial meetings. The speaker responded that the meeting in 2010 would be the first and so we would have to see what emerges. It is likely to be a bit freer flowing and a chance to bring up new ideas.

¹³ Some analysts believe that the consensus was blocked by Canada in order that the EU Commission could not gain observer status in retaliation for the Commission's support of a ban on seal products. see Michael Byers, "Breaking the ice," *Ottawa Citizen*, 27 October, 2009 (available at <http://byers.typepad.com/arctic/2009/10/breaking-the-ice.html>)

¹⁴ http://www.oceanlaw.org/downloads/arctic/Ilulissat_Declaration.pdf

¹⁵ Ms Hill-Marta Solberg, Chair of the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, Speech Arctic Council Ministerial meeting Tromsø, 29 April 2009, <http://www.arcticparl.org/res/site/file/Speech%20AC%20HMS%20290409.doc>

¹⁶ Tromsø Declaration: **Decide** to further strengthen the political role of the Arctic Council by having a meeting at deputy Minister level, with representatives of Permanent Participants, to discuss emerging issues between Ministerial meetings,

A question was also asked about the two new task forces established by the Arctic Council (search and rescue and short-lived climate forcers). These are also new and so it is not yet possible to evaluate them.

THE ARCTIC MARINE SHIPPING ASSESSMENT

The Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment (AMSA) was born out of the 2004 Arctic Council ministerial meeting. The declaration from that meeting requested that the Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment working group “conduct a comprehensive Arctic marine shipping assessment as outlined in the AMSP under the guidance of Canada, Finland and the United States as lead countries.” The AMSA was approved by the Arctic Council at its 2009 meeting. Mr. Kimmo Juurmaa, Project Manager, Offshore, Deltamarin Ltd. gave the Standing Committee a summary of some of the more significant parts of the report and where it may lead.

Mr Juurmaa first noted that the fundamental reason for the report lies in the fact that sea ice is diminishing and that the increase in sea ice between 2007 and 09 was not a reason to think that there would be a recovery. Nevertheless, the annual window of opportunity for transport was still very small, as the peak loss in ice is in late September while the sea ice was full as of yesterday (18th November).

From a factual perspective, one of the most significant findings of the AMSA report resulted from a shipping questionnaire that attempted to quantify the level of shipping activity in the Arctic in the year 2004. The conclusion was that there is already a significant amount of shipping happening, particularly fishing vessels, bulk cargo vessels, container ships and general cargo vessels, largely from the United States, Norway and fishing vessels from Iceland and the Faroe Islands.¹⁷ Over 5000 vessels were recorded in the circumpolar north during 2004. A limitation of these numbers is that there were no Russian sources of information, therefore, there were certainly more vessels recorded than reported as a result of the AMSA questionnaire. Anywhere there is vessel traffic there are certain to be accidents.

The AMSA developed four scenarios for the future to help plan for different management requirements depending on the two main drivers: level of governance; and resource and trade needs. It was concluded that the Arctic was currently in a “Polar Low” with low resource and trade demand and unstable governance bringing a murky and under-developed future for the Arctic. However, it is moving toward an “Arctic Race,” with high demand and unstable governance setting the stage for a “no holds barred” rush for Arctic wealth and resources. The need was therefore to do something about governance to move the future scenario to an “Arctic Saga,” with high demand and stable governance leading to a healthy rate of development that includes concern for preservation of Arctic ecosystems and cultures. The “Polar Preserve” scenario of high governance and low resource and trade demand was not discussed, likely because it is not seen as a realistic scenario.

The 17 recommendations approved by the Arctic Council were grouped by PAME under three headings: Enhancing Arctic Marine Safety; Building the Arctic Marine

¹⁷ Arctic Council, Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment 2009 Report, Table 5.1, p. 71, http://pame.arcticportal.org/images/stories/PDF_Files/AMSA_2009_Report_2nd_print.pdf

Infrastructure; and Protecting Arctic People and Environment. Canada, Denmark and Norway have indicated interest to co-lead one or both of recommendations I.B (International Marine Organization (IMO) Measures for Arctic Shipping) and I.D (Strengthening Passenger Ship Safety).

PAME has examined the requirements for follow-up on the recommendations. Much of the implementation will come from many different players, in particular national governments, international organizations such as the IMO and industry. PAME itself can encourage action where appropriate, continue to do research and also invite the participation of other Arctic Council working groups.

The presentation was followed by a question and answer session. The head of the Canadian delegation asked for more specifics about the ice free season and the logistics of transport. The season of open water is very short (a matter of weeks), and unpredictable and therefore still very risky. The Russians have experience with year round transport, but this requires, except in the case of very special vessels, the aid of icebreakers. In either case the limiting factor is the economics of the voyage. The costs are still very high (see section below on the site visit to Aker Arctic Technology Inc.).

The Swedish delegate noted that to get new guidelines for the Arctic Ocean at the IMO would be very difficult, for instance to have it classified as a Particularly Sensitive Sea Area.¹⁸ Mr. Juurmaa concurred, noting that there were many other nations interested in the Arctic as a sea route, which would make negotiations very difficult. The IMO is a slow tool but things were happening. However, he noted that all access to the Arctic requires passage through one of the Exclusive Economic Zones (as defined in UNCLOS, essentially the 200 nautical mile limit) of the five coastal states. One possibility for a unified approach to protecting the environment would be for the coastal state authorities to come to an agreement on access, within their limits of authority under UNCLOS.

A Finnish participant asked if large scale cooperative search and rescue was part of the follow-up. While the Arctic Council may discuss this, the most active discussions were taking place between Russia and Norway as well as Canada, the United States and Denmark.

A Russian delegation asked for clarification regarding the AMSA questionnaire and its conclusions that there were thousands of vessels in the Arctic. He was doubtful that there many that actually traversed the entire Arctic. It was noted that the results were based on the presence of vessels in large marine ecosystems, so that though there were only very few passages across, there was already the possibility of significant impact.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE ARCTIC CONFERENCE IN 2010 IN THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

The next Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region is to be hosted by the European Parliament in 2010. The Standing Committee is largely responsible for

¹⁸ See, IMO, Particularly Sensitive Sea Areas, http://www.imo.org/environment/mainframe.asp?topic_id=1357

deciding the dates of the Conference, the topics for discussion and helping to coordinate the agenda of the Conference.

The Standing Committee had previously confirmed the host of the Conference and had discussed the topics at the Ilulissat meeting of 2009. Mr. Henrik Olsen from the European Parliament informed the Committee about progress in the preparations for the Conference in 2010. It was suggested that the best dates would be 13-15 September and the location would be in Brussels. The Standing Committee confirmed these as the dates and location.

A draft program was circulated with the major topics being:

- Sustainable use of living resources in the Arctic;
- Education/research and the legacy of IPY; and
- The melting ice – consequences.

No official approval was given for the topics, but members agreed to send the names of possible speakers to the Secretariat of the Standing Committee.

Plans began for the following Conference in 2012 with the suggestion that, since all members in SCPAR had now hosted a Conference, that it would be best to return to the beginning and ask Iceland to be host.

NORTHERN DIMENSION PARTNERSHIP ON TRANSPORT AND LOGISTICS

The European Union's Northern Dimension policy originated as a method of managing relations between western Russia, particularly in the Barents and Baltic regions, and the EU. Since then Iceland and Norway have joined as equal partners. Canada and the United States are observers.

There are three partnerships within the ND: the environmental partnership; the public health and social well-being partnership; and the transport and logistics partnership. The last is the most recent, being agreed to in October 2008. Its intent is to promote cooperation in transport and logistics along the Northern Axis and in the Motorways of the Seas. One practical goal is to identify and remove bottlenecks. An MOU was signed in October 2009 between the partners and other interested parties (such as Belarus) with the goal of having the partnership operational in 2010. See the attached draft minutes (Appendix 1) for more details.

COOPERATION WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF THE ARCTIC

The University of the Arctic (UArctic) is a cooperative network of universities, colleges, and other organizations committed to higher education and research in the North. Its members share resources, facilities, and expertise to build post-secondary education programs that are relevant and accessible to northern students. The University's overall goal is to create a strong, sustainable circumpolar region by empowering northerners and northern communities through education and shared knowledge.

It promotes education that is circumpolar, interdisciplinary, and diverse in nature, and draws on its combined strengths to address the unique challenges of the region. The

University of the Arctic recognizes the integral role of indigenous peoples in northern education, and seeks to engage their perspectives in all of its activities.¹⁹

The Standing Committee has always been very supportive of the University of the Arctic (UARctic). Lars Kullerud spoke to the strengths of the University and its relationship with parliamentarians. The UARctic charter acknowledges the different qualities of its members. It has 17 collaborations focussing on particular themes, known as thematic networks. The UARctic can be used as a base of expertise to address many issues.

An aspect of parliamentary cooperation that he emphasized was that parliamentarians tend to be “braver” than governments in that, without the need to promote government policy, they can raise more controversial issues that, in time, can become mainstream issues. He felt that SCPAR was very important in this respect.

Canada and Finland have been very important and generous financial supporters of the University, but there seemed to be a question about securing continued support from the Canadian government.²⁰ Russia too is important, as it was noted that universities in Russia that are part of the UARctic have become federal institutions. Norway and Sweden also contribute as do Greenland and Iceland. Denmark has recently also announced its support.

¹⁹ Text from University of the Arctic, *About UARctic*, <http://www.uarctic.org/ThemeFront.aspx?m=6>

²⁰ According the Department and Foreign Affairs and International Trade Canada future funding for UARctic (Canada) is under consideration. UARctic (Canada) is undergoing the process of creating a legal entity to facilitate fund raising. This was one of the recommendations of the Jago report (<http://dl1.yukoncollege.yk.ca/uarctic/jagoexecsum>) which also recommended that the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs Canada support UARctic (Canada), through the legal entity, with \$2 million annually.

It was also noted that some international bodies are beginning to recognise the importance of coordinated northern research. The Nordic Council meeting in October 2009 recommended, in part, the following:

The Nordic Council recommends to the Nordic Council of Ministers

to bring a northern priority to Nordic research schools and scholarship schemes which adds weight by developing and drawing attention to the Nordic region with experts on the conditions in the Nordic region

*to strengthen mobility schemes with a northern priority to further develop the Nordic region as a goal for students and researchers from other regions and to take note of the opportunities to use the *University of the Arctic's GoNorth* initiative for this purpose.²¹*

Dr. Kullerud emphasized that it was very important to produce the next generation of researchers and that conferences, research and education were important tools toward that end. He expressed interest in joint workshops with parliamentarians on special topics. Noting that the Arctic Council does not address tourism, he suggested this as a possible workshop topic.

A Russian delegate noted that in some respects the UArctic was the “child” of the Standing Committee and that there was a long history of cooperation between the two organizations. He also reiterated the importance of the fact that the UArctic now involved federal universities, given that there are only eleven in Russia. A suggestion was that UArctic should be in more contact with international organizations such as UNESCO. He also felt that, while the networking and mobility programs were focussed on undergraduates, that there was room for greater emphasis on graduate studies.

Dr. Kullereud noted that UArctic had approached UNESCO but had not much success in gaining its attention, though Nordic countries had received some support. Graduate work was truly a priority for the UArctic.

STATUS OF THE WORK OF SCPAR

Delegates were invited to report on their country's work with respect to SCPAR. See the attached draft minutes (Appendix 1) for a summary of interventions.

The head of the Canadian delegation noted many of his nation's federal actions taking place in Canada's North, particularly those relevant to Fairbanks statement of the Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region. Canada has recently released its Northern Strategy.²²

With respect to protecting the marine environment he noted making reporting mandatory for all vessels under NORDREG (Arctic Canada Traffic Zone) and extending the coverage of the *Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act* to the full extent of Canada's Exclusive Economic Zone.

Various efforts are underway in support of northerner's health and well being including investing \$200 million over two years for social housing in the North and (related to

²¹ Nordic Council, *Statements, recommendations and internal resolutions 2009*, recommendation 22, http://www.norden.org/da/nordisk-raad/moder/sessioner/2009/sessionsdokumenter/Rek_liste%202009_ENG.pdf

²² Government of Canada, *Canada's Northern Strategy*, <http://www.northernstrategy.ca/cns/cns.pdf>

previous discussions about the University of the Arctic) support of education and the establishment of graduate student fellowships on Canada's role in the circumpolar world.

Investments in research, development and deployment of alternative and renewable energy sources in the North are being made under the \$15 million ecoENERGY for Aboriginal and Northern Communities Program.

Canada's presence in the North is also being enhanced through the procurement of a polar icebreaker and arctic offshore patrol ships as well as the launch of the RADARSAT-2 satellite.

NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of the Standing Committee will take place in Washington D.C., U.S.A. in the middle of March 2010 with the following meeting to be held in conjunction with the International Polar Year conference in Oslo, Norway, 7 June 2010.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Mr. Henrik Olsen, Principal Administrator, Inter-Parliamentary Relations for the European Parliament is retiring and so this was his last meeting. Having attended many meetings and being a strong advocate of Arctic issues, the Standing Committee thanked him warmly for his efforts and wished him well.

Site Visit to Aker Arctic Technology Inc.

In keeping with the Standing Committee's ongoing interest in transportation issues in the Arctic, members visited the head office of Aker Arctic Technology Inc. in Helsinki. The company offers this description on its website.

The company is running a brand-new facility in Helsinki, the only privately owned ice model testing facility in the world and is engaged in the business of research and development services, design and testing of icebreakers and other ice-going vessels as well as structures for arctic oil and gas field operations.

In addition to model and full scale testing services, the Company offers all kinds of consulting, design and engineering services, field expeditions, training and other technology services associated with technologies and operations in icy or severely cold conditions.

A portfolio of ice going ships is also available for shipowners and shipyards.

Our past references include 60 per cent of all the world's icebreakers, many Arctic or Antarctic research vessels and quite a number of different type of cargo vessels and offshore structures. The ice model technique developed by us and the FGX model ice is being used in various other research institutes both in Finland and Russia.²³

The members were given a presentation on the company and aspects of operating in the Arctic. The key driver for their work is oil and gas development, but there are many other aspects as well.

²³ Aker Arctic Technology Inc., *Aker Arctic Technology Inc - the Full Service Ice Technology Partner*, <http://www.akerarctic.fi/company.htm>

The use of Azipod thrusters, which are propellers driven by electric engines contained in pods external to the hull and that can turn through 360°, has allowed the creation of double acting ships that can run forward through ice free conditions and reverse through ice. This eliminates the need for icebreakers to accompany ships through the Arctic. Nuclear powered icebreakers can cost up to US \$70 000 per day so this clearly saves money. However, they remain expensive and use approximately 48 tonnes of fuel per day.

As was noted in the AMSA presentation, the limiting factor for shipping in the Arctic is economics. Currently only one-off trips are being performed for high value cargo. Regular trips based on just-in-time delivery are still not possible because of the economics and the fact that ships can still become immobilized in the ice causing unpredictable delays.

Respectfully submitted,

Mr. Dean Allison, M.P.
Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association

Appendix I: Draft Minutes of the Secretary General to the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region



CONFERENCE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS OF THE ARCTIC REGION
THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS OF THE ARCTIC REGION

MEETING IN HELSINKI
19 NOVEMBER 2009
Venue: The Finnish Parliament
Time: 09.00

Draft minutes

1. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND THE PROPOSED ORDER OF AGENDA ITEMS

APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINUTES FROM THE SCPAR-MEETING IN ILULISSAT 27 MAY 2009

Decision:

The Committee adopted the agenda and approved the minutes from the SCPAR-meeting in Ilulissat 27 May 2009.

2. UPDATE ON THE ACTIVITIES OF THE DANISH CHAIRMANSHIP OF THE ARCTIC COUNCIL

Denmark, together with Greenland and the Faroe Islands, is chairing the Arctic Council. Ms. Mikaela Engell, the Danish Senior Arctic Official, gave the Committee an update on the activities and a report from the first Senior Arctic Official (SAO) meeting in Copenhagen 12-13 November 2009.

The most important issue at the SAO-meeting was the preparations for COP 15 and to get consensus on the information to be presented at COP 15 the 14 December 2009 at the Bella Center. A report on the Greenland Ice Sheet will be presented by the Arctic Council.

Information about Arctic issues will also be presented at the Arctic Venue.

The SAOs further agreed that the Key Messages of Arctic Council's *Arctic Biodiversity Trends - 2010: selected indicators of change* report will be submitted to the Convention on Biological Diversity for inclusion in the upcoming third Global Biodiversity Outlook report.

The SAOs further approved follow-up activities to respond to the recommendations in the Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment (AMSA) 2009 Report. These include an Arctic Council review of the global and regional measures that are in place for the protection of the Arctic marine and coastal environment, and to enhance cooperation in oil spill prevention.

Ms. Engell also informed about the work of the Arctic Council's new Task Forces on "Search and Rescue" and on "Short-lived Climate Forcers".

The maintaining and strengthening the observing network – SAON – for long term monitoring in the Arctic will continue with a focus to benefit the people of the Arctic.

Denmark succeeded Norway followed by Sweden as chair of the Arctic Council. A secretariat in Tromsø has been established to strengthen the Arctic Council e.g. by establishing an Arctic Council archive. The Danish Chairmanship hope the secretariat continues after the Scandinavian chairmanship period.

A seminar on suicide prevention in was arranged in Nuuk.

One of the great challenges in the work of the Arctic Council is the observer question. The SAO-meeting in Copenhagen had 200 participants and the rules about accepting observers are not very clear. The role of the permanent participants should not be diminished by the observers. China, South-Korea, Japan and the European Commission are applying for observer status.

The Danish chairmanship would like to welcome all interest. If the Arctic Council can't open up to interested states, it is a danger that they will find other ways of promoting their interest.

There is no need for a new legal framework for the Arctic, but there is a need to look at some aspects the legal situation.

"Megatrends of the Arctic" is a Danish Chairmanship project. The Working Groups have produced many interesting assessments and documents. Is it possible to put them on

top of each other to extract the essence? The Danish Chairmanship will try and present the findings and suggest new directions for the Arctic cooperation.

As a response to a recommendation from the Fairbanks statement to have ministerial meetings every year, the Arctic Council will have a deputy minister level meeting in the year between the Ministerial meetings. The format is not decided yet, but it may have a more thematic focus, maybe on the two task forces of the Arctic Council.

Decision:

The Committee took note of the information.

3. AMSA RECOMMENDATIONS AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

The Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment (AMSA) mandate was from the Ministerial Meeting in 2004 and the Assessment with recommendations were approved at the 2009 Ministerial meeting. Mr. Kimmo Juurmaa from Deltamarin Ltd. presented the recommendations and the implementation plan.

In 2009 the Northern Sea Route was practically open and in 2008 both the Northern Sea Route and the Northwest Passage were open for a short time. However there is still a lot of ice and the window for shipping is still very limited.

The member states, Permanent Participants, industry, classifications societies, many non-Arctic stakeholders and more participated in making the Assessment.

The shipping is happening today and is increasing year by year, and as a result of the increasing activity more accidents happen.

In the assessment scenarios for the Arctic shipping activity were made. The main drivers were identified as “resources and demand for utilizing them” and “the governance issues”.

The report is a negotiated text and approved by the member states. It includes 17 different recommendations and can be divided into three recommendations themes:

- Enhancing Arctic marine safety
 - Protecting Arctic people and environment
 - Building the Arctic marine infrastructure

The working group “Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment” (PAME) has made a matrix for following up the recommendations. This looks at the recommendation, identifies the follow-up needed on a global, regional or national level, and how PAME will continue to work with the recommendation.

Finally Mr Juurmaa, in a personal comment, pointed to that PAME is not strong enough to implement all the recommendations and that the national states must be involved – together with IMO. Arctic inhabitants, industry and research institutions must also be engaged in the future process.

On question from the Committee Mr. Juurmaa informed that the Northwest Passage had only open waters for a few weeks in September and even at that time the risk of ice was still large. With icebreakers you can have year around operations, but it is a matter of cost.

Whether or not it is likely to get the Arctic Ocean characterized as a Particular Sensitive Sea Area (PSSA) in the International Maritime Organisation (IMO), Mr. Juurmaa noted that UNCLOS article 234 gives the coastal states authority to give regulations in the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), and you need to go through the EEZ to enter the international waters in the middle of the Arctic Ocean. That way might be more effective than working through the IMO.

Plans to have large scale SAR exercises should, according to Mr. Juurmaa, be further discussed between the Arctic states.

The work to get the IMO-guidelines for sailing in ice-covered waters made mandatory is a work in process and it moves slowly.

Finally Mr. Juurmaa noted that many players must get involved to implement the recommendations in AMSA.

Decision:

The Committee took note of the information.

4. PREPARATIONS FOR THE ARCTIC CONFERENCE IN 2010 IN THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

Mr. Henrik Olsen from the European Parliament informed the Committee about the progress in the preparations for the conference in 2010, with the 13-15 September 2010 as suggested dates and a draft program.

The members will recommend speakers and a speaker with indigenous background was suggested.

With regards to the organizing of the CPAR in 2012, the Committee decided to start from the top again, starting with the host of the first conference in 1993, Iceland.

Decision:

The Committee decided that the CPAR of 2010 shall take place in the European Parliament in Brussels 13-15 September 2010.

The Secretary General contacts Iceland to discuss the possibility of hosting the CPAR in 2012.

5. NORTHERN DIMENSION PARTNERSHIP ON TRANSPORT AND LOGISTICS

Mr. Harro Pitkänen from the Nordic Investment Bank presented the new Northern Dimension partnership in transport and logistics to the Committee.

A Memorandum of Understanding was signed 21 October 2009 by the partnership countries and other interested countries, including Belarus. The partnership is planned to be operational in 2010.

The new partnership is linked to the European Union transport policy via Northern Axis and Motorways of the Seas, and sub-regional cooperation such as the Barents corridor.

The partnership aims to take a regional approach to remove the bottlenecks in a sustainable way and promote international trade. They will take a practical approach and not only physical infrastructure, but also customs procedures and trade barriers.

In developing an action plan, concrete goals and targets for the parties will be identified, and the methodology to prioritize projects must be clear. One needs to avoid local and regional priorities to win over the cross-regional aims.

A secretariat for the partnership will be established in Helsinki at the premises of the Nordic Investment Bank.

The role of the international financial institutions will be important. Infrastructure is often publicly financed, but we need other financing as well as long term lending. The Nordic Investment Bank, the European Investment Bank, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the World Bank are invited to attend the partnership activities as observers.

On a question from the Committee about the possibility to involve all the Arctic states as owners of the Nordic Investment Bank, Mr. Pitkänen said that needed to be addressed to the owners of the bank. But he found the idea interesting.

Information was given that the second Northern Dimension parliamentary conference will take place in February 2011 in Tromsø.

The partnership will include improvement of road-connections, railroad, and transport at sea and air.

Decision:

The Committee took note of the information.

6. COOPERATION WITH THE UNIVERSITY OF THE ARCTIC

Mr. Lars Kullerud, the President of the University of the Arctic, informed about the 121 members all over the Arctic sharing resources.

The institutions decide which networks they want and there are 17 networks between the UArctic members. The networks include areas such as: Arctic medicine, Arctic Agriculture and natural use, Northern Governance, Indigenous Arts and Crafts, Journalism etc.

The UArctic is about sharing. Shared focus – thematic networks, shared learning – undergraduate studies, shared competence – graduate studies, shared knowledge – knowledge and dialogue, shared experiences – mobility.

Canada and Finland have been generous supporters from the beginning. Canada provides 750 000 C\$ plus some additional money from the provinces. Finland provides around 500 000 Euros through the University of Lapland.

Norway has a proposed an increase in the funding from 4.5 million to 5.5 million NOK.

Sweden gives around 500 000 SEK

Denmark will also support from next year with around 3 million DKK.

Greenland, Iceland and Russia contributes through sponsoring mobility programs.

The UArctic would be interested in cooperation with SCPAR on how to create future scientists, arrange joint workshops, meetings and conferences. UArctic would be happy to contribute in the next conference in the European Parliament.

A possible topic for future cooperation could be tourism in the Arctic. Members of the Committee underlined the strong history of cooperation between the parliamentarians and UArctic.

With regards to cooperation with UNESCO, Mr. Kullerud said that UArctic have taken some initiatives towards UNESCO for cooperation, but this has not yet been successful.

The UArctic work to get more post graduate programs.

Decision:

The Committee took note of the information.

7. STATUS OF THE WORK OF SCPAR

West-Nordic Council

Ms. Olina Thorvardottir, Vice-Chairman of the West-Nordic Council, reported from the cooperation between the Faeroe Islands, Greenland and Iceland.

The natural resources and especially the fisheries are very important to all the West-Nordic countries and the conference taking place in June next year will focus on the different fishing management systems in these countries. The Standing Committee is invited to the conference.

The Vice-Chair of the West-Nordic Council also underlined the protest against the European Union ban on seal products.

Finally the thematic conference this year, focusing on the unskilled workers, concluded that exchange – programs and better possibilities of distance learning are important to improve the situation for this group.

Norway

The Norwegian parliament has elected a delegation to the Arctic parliamentary cooperation with 6 members and 6 substitute members. The delegation has funded the making of 6 roll-ups which will be put on display at the Arctic Venue during the COP 15 in Copenhagen.

With regards to seal products it is interesting to see how can we better interact and lobby the European Parliament – maybe the Standing Committee can join forces in this case.

Canada

Canada has drawn up a Strategy for the North and it includes:

- A renewed focus on human health and the effects of climate change on human health
- A new project to promote clean energy for northern communities
- A strategy for strengthening the support for northern universities through fellowships
- Plans to get new icebreakers, patrol ships and satellites

- Social housing in the north a priority

With regards to shipping in the Arctic Canada is looking at the possibility of extent the national environmental regime to 200 nautical miles.

Denmark/Greenland

Inuit Ataqatigiit (IA) won 44 % of the votes in the Greenlandic election in June and that ended 30 years of Siumut-government in Greenland.

The Greenlandic self rule came into force the 21 June 2009. Still there is no agreement between Denmark and Greenland on CO2 emissions. Greenland want develop the industry and emit more CO2. The COP 15 will take place in Copenhagen and SCPAR will be present at the Arctic Venue.

As Denmark does not support the ban of seal products in the EU and it will be good to discuss in the European Parliament next September. Juliane Henningsen will be away on maternity leave until next October and Sofia Rossen will attend the next meetings.

Sweden

The Swedish parliament debated the EU communication on Arctic policy. In this debate the lack of focus on the people living in the Arctic was criticised. A minority in the parliament want a moratorium on further exploitation of resources in the Arctic.

Sweden will have the presidency of Barents Euro-Arctic Council from 2009-2011 and hopefully Sweden also will get an Arctic strategy from 2011. Sweden will also have the presidency of the Arctic Council 2011-2013.

Nordic Council

The Nordic Council wants to arrange an Arctic conference to follow-up the Ilulissat-conference in September 2008, and passed a recommendation on this topic at the Nordic Council session in Stockholm 29 October 2009.

In advance of the Session a seminar on climate change and COP 15 took place, and a statement from this seminar was circulated.

Russia

Russia thanked the Finnish parliament for hosting the meeting in a good way, and found that it is a good tradition to have a workshop before the SCPAR meeting. Russia also thanked for the support to the Nord-Stream pipeline in the Baltic Sea.

As many Arctic countries have adopted an Arctic strategy it would be interesting to analyze the different Arctic strategies to look at the differences and similarities.

Another possible topic for cooperation will be how to develop a smart economy, an economy of knowledge and innovation, to supplement the current economy based on export of natural resources.

It was suggested to create a youth parliament of the Arctic region to build a bridge to the next generations of young politicians. This group can join the meetings of the Arctic parliamentarians.

The Arctic Council is doing a good job but it needs to be on a Prime Minister level to increase the importance.

Finland

A report on Arctic policy from the government created a long debate in the parliament 18 November 2009.

There were two main proposals:

- Finland must get an own arctic strategy,
- Create an advisory body for the government on Arctic policies

European parliament

The European Commission revised Arctic policies will be settled at a meeting 8 December 2009 and this new document will be debated in the EP.

There are plans to have a joint conference on Arctic policies with the Nordic Council of Ministers.

8. NEXT MEETING

The next meeting will be in Washington in week 11 and in Oslo 7 June 2010.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

As this was the last meeting of Mr. Henrik Olsen representing the European Parliament, the Committee thanked him for all the good work he had done to promote Arctic issues, and wished him all the best for the future.



CONFERENCE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS OF THE ARCTIC REGION
THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS OF THE ARCTIC REGION

MEETING IN HELSINKI
19 November 2009

List of participants

MEMBERS

<i>Canada</i>	Mr. Dean Allison, MP Mr. Massimo Pacetti, MP Dr. Tim Williams, Science and Technology Division, Parliamentary Information and Research Service
<i>Denmark/Greenland</i>	Ms. Juliane Henningsen, MP Mr. Peder H. Pedersen, Adviser
<i>EP</i>	Mr. Henrik Olsen, Principal Administrator, Inter- Parliamentary Relations
<i>Finland</i>	Mr. Hannes Manninen, MP Mr. Guy Lindström, Deputy Director
<i>Norway</i>	Mr. Morten Høglund, MP Mr. Kjell Myhre-Jensen, Head of Section
<i>Russia</i>	Mr. Mikhail Nikolaev, Senator Mr. Kirill S. Mangush, Counsellor Mr. Vitaly Artamonov, Adviser Mr. Vasily Usoltsev, MP Mrs. Irina Kuzmina, Secretary
<i>Sweden</i>	Ms. Sinikka Bohlin, MP Ms. Eva Hjelm, Senior Officer

PERMANENT PARTICIPANTS

Indigenous Peoples Secretariat Mr. Jesse Tungilik, Intern Junior Advisor

OBSERVERS

West Nordic Council Ms. Ólína Þorvarðardóttir, Vice-President of the West Nordic Council, MP, Iceland

Mr. Thordur Thorarinsson, Secretary General

Nordic Council Mr. Torkil Sørensen, Senior Adviser

GUESTS

Ms. Mikaela Engell, SAO, Danish Chairmanship of the Arctic Council

Mr. Kimmo Juurmaa, Project Manager, Offshore, Deltamarin Ltd

Mr. Harro Pitkänen, Deputy Head of Lending, Nordic Investment Bank

Mr. Lars Kullerud, President, University of the Arctic

Ms. Outi Snellman, Vice-President, University of the Arctic

Mr. Harald Brekke, Senior Geologist, Member of CLCS

Mr. Hannu Halinen, SAO, Ambassador, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Finland

Ms. Jenni Koistinen, Embassy of Canada in Helsinki

SECRETARIAT

Mr. Bjørn Willy Robstad, Secretary General

INTERPRETERS

Mr. Aleksei Repin

Mr. Igor Eskin

Travel Costs

ASSOCIATION	Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association
ACTIVITY	Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region
DESTINATION	Helsinki, Finland
DATES	November 18-19, 2009
DELEGATION	
SENATE	
HOUSE OF COMMONS	Mr. Dean Allison, M.P. Mr. Massimo Pacetti, M.P.
STAFF	Dr. Tim Williams, Analyst
TRANSPORTATION	\$11,308.10
ACCOMMODATION	\$ 1,798.74
HOSPITALITY	\$ 0.00
PER DIEMS	\$ 968.56
OFFICIAL GIFTS	\$ 0.00
MISCELLANEOUS / REGISTRATION FEES	\$ 0.00
TOTAL	\$14,075.40