

Canada - Europe
Parliamentary Association



Association parlementaire
Canada - Europe

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

Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association

**Copenhagen, Denmark
10-11 June 2014**

Report

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Ryan Leef led a Canadian delegation of two, including Mr. Dennis Bevington, to the meeting of the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region (the Standing Committee) held in Copenhagen, Denmark, 10 June 2014. 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 (CPAR) 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 Tenth Conference was held in Akureyri, Iceland, 5-7 September 2012.¹ The Eleventh Conference is to take place in Whitehorse, Yukon, 9-11 September, 2014.

The Conference adopts a statement with recommendations to the Arctic Council (AC) and to the governments of the eight Arctic states and the European Commission. The Standing Committee closely monitors how the governments implement the Conference Statement, and take new initiatives to further Arctic cooperation.

Between conferences, Arctic parliamentary cooperation is facilitated by the Standing Committee, which began 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 AC. The Standing Committee takes part in the work of the Council as an observer.²

MEETING SUMMARY³

The agenda for the meeting and the draft minutes of the previous meeting held 24 February 2014, Ottawa, Canada, were adopted.

A. PRESENTATION OF THE DANISH ARCTIC POLICY

Mr. Martin Lidegaard, Minister of Foreign Affairs, presented the Danish Arctic policy. The Danish Arctic Strategy⁴ emphasizes the need for international and domestic cooperation

¹ The Conference report is available at: <http://www.arcticparl.org/files/conference-report%2C-akureyri.pdf>

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

³ The draft minutes for the meeting can be found in Appendix 1. The text of this report focuses on material not covered in full in the minutes, acting as a supplement, with a Canadian focus, to the minutes.

“towards the common overall goal of creating a peaceful, prosperous and sustainable future for the Arctic.” Minister Lidgaard began his presentation by stating that it is crucial to involve Arctic parliamentarians in this cooperation to address Arctic issues. Cooperation between the five Arctic coastal states was also stressed, specifically by noting the Ilulissat Declaration of 2008.⁵ It is a common responsibility of all Arctic nations to maintain peace and security while establishing economic, social and environmental development.

Noting the central role of the Arctic Council in achieving this overall goal, the Minister affirmed Denmark’s support for more observers. This would benefit not only the Arctic but the whole world. He noted that non-Arctic states should be treated in a consistent manner and stated his support for the European Union’s application for observer status. With the EU seal product ban final decision at the World Trade Organization⁶ it was his hope that the EU status at the Arctic Council could be resolved.

During discussion on possible new areas for legal agreements between the Arctic states the Minister noted that some point to *The Antarctic Treaty* and its protocol on environmental protection as examples for the Arctic.⁷ The original treaty is about preserving the Antarctic for peaceful purposes and scientific research while the protocol commits parties to the comprehensive protection of the Antarctic environment. The Minister, however, noted that the Arctic is a different situation as there are no permanent residents in the Antarctic.

With respect to the remark that there is a lack of search and rescue capacity in the waters around Greenland he questioned the meaning of adequate SAR capacity. For example, when is enough, enough? The tourist boats in particular should be responsible but all actors have to be involved.

A Canadian delegate asked the Minister about his thoughts on the nature of the role of the Arctic Economic Council (AEC). He noted that the roles and actions of the AEC were being developed “as we speak” and would also depend on new roles taken on by the Arctic Council itself. Of importance was the fact that the Arctic is still a high risk area for investments because of weather and infrastructure challenges. Attracting investments in the first place and ensuring that there is economic activity to benefit people were therefore seen as issues to be addressed.

⁴ Denmark, Greenland and the Faroe Islands, [Kingdom of Denmark Strategy for the Arctic 2011– 2020](#).

⁵ [The Ilulissat Declaration Arctic Ocean Conference Ilulissat, Greenland, 27 – 29 May 2008](#).

⁶ See World Trade Organization, [“European Communities — Measures Prohibiting the Importation and Marketing of Seal Products,” Dispute Settlement: Dispute DS400, 22 May 2014](#).

⁷ See: Secretariat of the Antarctic treaty, [The Antarctic Treaty](#).

Regarding the development of the Polar Code⁸ under the International Maritime Organization, the Minister stated that there should not be a rush to the bottom line. There should be high standards in the agreement or there should be no agreement. The question was posed as to what the Arctic coastal states would do in the absence of a strong Polar Code.

In response to a question on indigenous businesses the Minister commented that defining an indigenous business was already difficult and that as indigenous peoples develop and adopt new models of business it would become even more difficult.

B. TO THE BENEFIT OF GREENLAND

Professor Minik Rosing of the Natural History Museum of Denmark and chairman of the Committee for Greenlandic Mineral Resources to the Benefit of Society, presented the committee's report *To the Benefit of Greenland*.⁹

Professor Rosing described the historic economic links between Greenland and Europe from whale oil to crysolite¹⁰ before elaborating on the committee's report. In summary, the report essentially concludes that Greenland has insufficient human resources and infrastructure capacity to exploit its non-renewable resource potential sufficiently to wean itself off the block grants from Denmark. The report suggested that better harvesting of living resources could be an advantage as well as international collaboration to put a price on the preservation of nature. However, limitations on increasing revenues from its living resources in combination with the demographics of Greenland inevitably lead to a deficit situation.

The Chair of the Standing Committee, who is from Greenland, noted that it was important to identify the advantages of the Arctic and use them to develop it in its own way, not using the models used elsewhere in the world.

C. ARCTIC COOPERATION ON MANAGEMENT OF LIVING RESOURCES

Mr. Njord Wegge, Senior Research Fellow at Norway's Fridtjof Nansen Institute, presented information on cooperation in management of living resources, specifically fisheries. The fisheries in question were those in the high Arctic Ocean beyond the 200 nautical mile

⁸ See International Maritime Organization, "[Development of an international code of safety for ships operating in polar waters \(Polar Code\)](#)," *Shipping in polar waters*.

⁹ The Committee for Greenlandic Mineral Resources to the Benefit of Society, [To the Benefit of Greenland](#), January, 2014.

¹⁰ Crysolite is a mineral associated with a deposit in Greenland, now depleted, that is used in the manufacture of aluminum.

Exclusive Economic Zones¹¹ of the five coastal Arctic states. Such waters are generally characterized by depths of 4,000 to 5,000 metres.

Mr. Wegge began by summarizing the current legal regime governing high Arctic fisheries. The 1995 *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* (in force December 2001) would apply to the high Arctic Ocean as would, in part, the *Convention on the Future Multilateral Cooperation in North-East Atlantic Fisheries*.¹² Other regional fisheries management organizations also exist.¹³ He also noted that there seemed to be no desire to use the Arctic Council as an organization to address fisheries management issues.

With changing oceanic ecosystems managing the high Arctic may become more important. For instance fish had been caught up to 82° N, north of Svalbard, a new occurrence. The five Arctic coastal states agreed in February 2014 to a temporary prohibition of commercial fishing in the high seas of the central Arctic Ocean until a regulatory regime is in place, but noted that “commercial fishing in the high seas area of the central Arctic Ocean is unlikely to occur in the near future.”¹⁴

He concluded by noting that non-Arctic coastal states might be involved in the future, as well as posing questions such as: whether an agreement is needed; who would decide on an agreement; whether experimental fisheries should take place; and how Indigenous fisheries would be accounted for.

A Canadian delegate commented on this issue noting that fisheries may be migrating, not expanding, their populations thus leaving other areas void of fish. He noted that: ocean currents are changing; the oceans’ are acidifying; and predation may be changing.

In response, Mr. Wegge noted that areas void of fish would usually be filled by migrating fish from the south but that there might be winners and losers in the fisheries. Migration is normal, noting the mackerel war in the area of Faeroe Islands and Iceland as the result of mackerel migrating into their fishing areas. He further commented on the movement of predators suggesting that it was too early to know if predators would follow fish migration to the Arctic, as it would depend on such criteria as the need for land.

¹¹ The coastal state has sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring and exploiting, conserving and managing the natural resources, whether living or non-living in the exclusive economic zone, [United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea](#), Part V.

¹² See [North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission](#).

¹³ Note the [North Atlantic Fisheries Organization](#) also has jurisdiction, for example, over waters between Canada and Greenland, though these are within the EEZs of Canada and the Kingdom of Denmark.

¹⁴ [Chairman’s Statement](#), Meeting on Arctic Fisheries, Nuuk, Greenland, 24-26 February 2014.

On indigenous participation in the activities of the five coastal Arctic states, he noted that it was not an official organization and that it would have to be up to the central governments to agree on such participation. The Chair of SCPAR noted that it is important to have indigenous participation at meetings of the Arctic five coastal states.

D. TOWARDS COOPERATION AND CAPACITY-BUILDING IN ARCTIC PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Kristian Sørensen, senior researcher at the University of Copenhagen, introduced the topic of cooperation in preparedness and response by summarizing his conclusion that regional cooperation becomes more difficult as nations move from signing agreements to actually implementing cooperation.

Emergency management is difficult, complex and expensive. Being a shared responsibility it needs champions both domestically and for increased regional cooperation. Cooperation has to go beyond memoranda of understanding to include training and exercises. Mr. Kristensen posited that the Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response working group of the Arctic Council was the obvious venue for cooperation to occur, but resources need to come from individual nations.

A Canadian delegate emphasized that emergency preparedness needs to be a risk management exercise in that the types of risks and their likelihood have to be understood. Preventive measures can then be used to reduce the probability of the more frequent event occurring. Low cost actions such as people taking locators would prevent them from getting lost on land. The speaker extended this idea to advocating mapping of vulnerability to identify what makes countries vulnerable or resilient. The Canadian delegate reiterated that in a world of limited resources and increasing Arctic traffic that it is necessary to understand the likelihood of events occurring and applying risk management to emergency preparedness.

E. CONFERENCE IN WHITEHORSE 9-11 SEPTEMBER 2014

The head of the Canadian delegation introduced the latest version of the draft program for the Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region to be held in Whitehorse, Yukon, 9-11 September 2014. No comments were made.

Rapporteurs for the four themes then presented outlines of their approaches to the themes. Mr. Bevington of Canada is the rapporteur on Sustainable Infrastructure Development. The focus of Mr. Bevington's report will be: renewable energy; food security; infrastructure that supports sustainable economic activities such as tourism; and training and research through the University of the Arctic.

The latest draft conference statement was discussed and various ideas exchanged (see Draft Minutes).

F. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND CAPACITY BUILDING IN THE NORTH

The Standing Committee has been developing a report on economic development and capacity building in the North entitled *Capacity Building and Economic Development in the High North*. A similar process on the subject of governance, in the lead up to the Tenth Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, led to a strong influence on the Conference Statement. The latest seventh draft of the paper was discussed.

One member felt that it was important to discuss regional level transport, citing the Northern Dimension Transport and Logistics partnership.¹⁵ Cross border cooperation was recommended as a means to address shortages of labour in certain industries.

The head of the Canadian delegation expressed his opinion that the recommendation regarding making “overall strategies for assessing environmental, social and cultural consequences when developing natural resources in the Arctic” had solely negative implications that did not reflect the text of the report which speaks of both “social benefits and costs” of development projects. He suggested adding the concept of benefits of development to the recommendation. In a separate note, he suggested that the report should be consistent in its use of “North” and Arctic.”

G. STATUS OF THE WORK OF SCPAR

The Chair announced that she will be stepping down after the Conference in September. There will therefore have to be decisions made regarding a new chair of the Standing Committee at the meeting of the Committee following the Conference.

The Chair then related to the Committee an exchange of letters between herself and the Canadian Chairmanship of the Arctic Council (Minister Aglukkaq). The exchange related to an incident at the meeting of the Senior Arctic Officials that took place in Yellowknife, Northwest Territories, 26 – 27 March 2014. The Vice-Chair of the Standing Committee, Mr. Bevington, requested to address the SAOs but was refused. The letter to Minister Aglukkaq noted that the Chair of the Committee was “very disappointed” at this “historical decision.” In return, Minister Aglukkaq noted the “very large and time-consuming agenda” of the SAO meeting which precluded verbal statements.

The Vice-Chair then addressed the Committee noting the breadth and importance of the work of the Arctic Council, concluding that there was a need for active participation in the work of the Arctic Council. There was therefore a need to re-establish the relationship between Arctic parliamentarians and the Arctic Council.

The Chair then summarized her conclusions from this exchange of letters. She saw a movement in the Arctic Council that needed to be countered with clear communication. The

¹⁵ See [Northern Dimension Partnership on Transport and Logistics](#).

Standing Committee is made up of members of parliaments and therefore represents the Arctic peoples. As such it should be allowed to give short speeches at meetings of the SAOs and at the working groups of the Arctic Council. She felt that it was necessary to reiterate that the Standing Committee wants to be in direct dialogue with the SAOs.

The Head of the Canadian delegation spoke to the necessity of caution in the wording of letters such as these. He noted that he was not challenging the right of the Standing Committee, as an observer to the Arctic Council with a little higher stake, to request to address the SAOs. However, he was concerned that the language in the letter might have been a bit strong, particularly if this was not truly a historical decision. The language of such letters must be carefully crafted or could be perceived as a shot over the bow of the recipient of such a letter, in this case the Minister of the Arctic Council.

The Chair of the Committee responded by confirming that such a request had never been refused. This situation was new and different. Her perception was that the Arctic Council was becoming more rigid in the way it works, referring to how Greenland had previously been treated. There is a job for the Standing Committee, which, being made up of parliamentarians, represents the people, to be in open dialogue with the Arctic Council. If there are time constraints, particularly with more delegations at meetings, then perhaps observers could be categorized and parliamentarians, as representatives of the people, should be given the time to address SAOs. There was general agreement to her suggestion that this issue could be addressed in the conference statement of the eleventh Conference.

There followed a round table of activities of the delegations (see Draft Minutes).

H. NEXT MEETINGS OF SCPAR

The next meetings of the Standing Committee will take place on 9 September and 10 September immediately preceding and following the Conference. The Chair will step down at the meeting on 10 September. The next meeting after this will take place in Helsinki, Finland, 10-21 November, 2014, and will include a seminar on increased cooperation on security in the Arctic.

Respectfully submitted,

Mr. David Tilson, M.P.
President
Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association

CONFERENCE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS OF THE ARCTIC REGION
THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS OF THE ARCTIC REGION
MEETING IN COPENHAGEN

10 JUNE 2014

Venue: Landstingssalen, Folketinget, (The Danish Parliament)

Draft minutes

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

Decision:

The Committee adopted the agenda and the proposed order of agenda items for the SCPAR meeting.

2. APPROVAL OF DRAFT MINUTES FROM THE SCPAR-MEETING IN OTTAWA 24 FEBRUARY 2014

Decision:

The Committee approved the minutes from the SCPAR-meeting in Ottawa 24 February 2014

3. PRESENTATION OF THE DANISH ARCTIC POLICY

Mr. Martin Lidegaard, Minister of Foreign Affairs, introduce the Committee to the Danish Arctic strategy and underlined the importance of the Arctic in Denmark and internationally.

The political, economic and social challenges caused by climate change, increased marine activity and accessible raw materials were mentioned as influential factors in Arctic development. The goal is sustainable development in a secure Arctic area

The Kingdom of Denmark has a shared interest in the Arctic. The Ministry of Defense has initiated a study on future challenges in the Arctic. The study will be finished by 2017 and prepare the ground for further initiatives.

Minister Lidegaard further underlined the importance of the establishment of the Arctic Economic Council and the approved mandatory guidelines in IMO for shipping in ice-covered waters.

The Minister acknowledged the central position of the Arctic Council in the Arctic cooperation and that Denmark is a strong supporter of the positive development of the Council with the two legal agreements signed as important achievement. The minister would like to see more of this and focus on implementation of existing agreements and decisions. Denmark is in favor of an inclusive approach and include more observers, such as EU.

The cooperation on fisheries and living resources has started with meetings between the five Arctic coastal states. Minister Lidegaard would like to involve more states in this cooperation

On questions from the Committee the Minister noted that the global warming cause changed migration patterns for some fish stocks and they also enter areas further north. There is a need of a dialogue on how we ensure sustainable fisheries in this new situation.

On the question of possible new areas for legal agreements between the Arctic states the minister identified agreements addressing preservation of the nature, sustainable development and fisheries. He was also positive with regards to a closer cooperation between the Ministers of Environment.

On the issue of security cooperation the Minister distinguished between military and civil security. The Arctic is a low tension area of cooperation and through the Ilulissat declaration the Arctic coastal states have committed themselves to peaceful solutions to potential disagreements. There is a need of close cooperation with regards to shipping lanes and maritime activity to ensure the Arctic is safe to travel and operate in.

As the area is so huge one needs to define what enough SAR capacity is and how the responsibility of the operators shall be defined. The Arctic countries should continue and broaden the cooperation in IMO on the Polar Code.

With regards to the establishment of the Arctic Economic Council its development is up to the AEC itself. The Minister himself would like to the AEC to address environmental challenges, how to ensure economic activities which benefit the people and how to attract investors to the Arctic which is still to be considered a high risk area.

On question about the involvement of indigenous peoples in the AEC, the Minister pointed to the changing content of what are indigenous businesses and that the Danish government will continue a dialogue with the Faroe Islands and Greenland and support their choices in this respect.

Finally the Minister acknowledged the aspirations of many in Greenland of independence, and Denmark will work together with Greenland towards this dream/aim. However the Minister still hope to have a Kingdom of Denmark also in the future.

Decision:

The Committee took note of the information.

4. TO THE BENEFIT OF GREENLAND

Professor Minik Rosing, University of Copenhagen, introduced the Committee to the report “To the Benefit of Greenland”. Greenland has been a source of resources to Europe for centuries, mainly minerals and fish. The report establishes the factual basis for the mineral resources in Greenland today.

The mineral deposits in Greenland are likely to provide an additional source of income to the Greenlandic society, but living resources will still be most important. There will also be a need of foreign investments and workers. Current operators come from Canada, US, Europe, and one Chinese company.

The report identifies 10 main challenges for Greenland. The legislative basis is good but the infrastructure is poorly developed. However the melting ice improves the accessibility, both to the mineral resources and to Greenland as such.

The Mineral Strategy from the Government of Greenland estimates that 3-5 mines will be opened before 2018, but the report from Mr. Rosing estimates that one new mine will open before 2018.

One of the main conclusions in the report is that even with full speed in the mining development over the coming years, Greenland will only partly be able to reduce the block grant from Denmark.

With a slow development and with a possible creation of a mineral wealth fund, and education of a bigger local work force, Greenland would still need financial support from Denmark.

Other future possibilities might include more exploration of marine renewable resources or test the possibilities of financial support for preservation in the Arctic – leave large areas unspoiled.

On questions from the Committee on the differing projections between the report and government for new mines before 2018, Mr. Rosing noted that Greenland is facing problems and looks for ways out. The view of the explorations companies is in general too positive but the politicians have chosen to listen to them.

With regards to oil, Mr. Rosing said that Greenland is not likely to have export of oil in the near future. There has not been identified any deposits, the technology as of today is not for use in these Arctic waters, and there will be no drilling this year.

On a question about taxation the Mr. Rosing noted that the mineral resources are a part of the Self Government of Greenland and governed from Greenland, and that they tax the earnings and a the royalty on production with the new government is 37% of the profit. In addition comes the taxation of workers.

Further on the issue of labour force, Mr. Rosing noted that there will be a need of many foreign workers when opening mines in Greenland as there is little unemployed local work force. These workers may come from China, Poland or Australia, as we see other places in the world.

As for the potential of tourism in Greenland Mr. Rosing noted that this was not in the mandate of the report to consider, but he personally sees a potential in tourism, but there is a lack of infrastructure to accommodate larger tourism.

Finally Mr. Rosing agreed that the potential for cooperation between the Arctic states is huge, but we should not turn it into any other region, but build on what is special in the Arctic.

Decision:

The Committee took note of the information.

5. ARCTIC COOPERATION ON MANAGEMENT OF LIVING RESOURCES

Mr. Njord Wegge, Senior Research Fellow, PhD, at the Fridtjof Nansen Institute introduced the Committee to cooperation on fisheries and the agreement reached in Nuuk 24 February 2014 between the Arctic Coastal states.

The Arctic Ocean is defined by the International Hydrographic Organization which gives us 5 Arctic coastal states. Beyond the 200 nm EEZ we have the High Seas beyond the jurisdiction of a particular coastal state.

To regulate fisheries and provide for international cooperation in the High Seas we have the UN Fisheries Agreement from 1995 which regulate cross boarder resources. There are also several Regional Fisheries Management Agreements (RFMOs), including NEAFC (North East Atlantic Fisheries Cooperation) which includes a small part of the Arctic Ocean North of Svalbard and West of Greenland.

There is not much data on what is actually under the ice in the Arctic Ocean. With new migration patterns in the Arctic Ocean, some new fishes are likely to enter the Arctic Ocean, especially those fishes which feed in the water column, Polar Cod being the most likely.

The Arctic coastal states in the Arctic Council has so far been reluctant to bring fisheries into the Arctic Council cooperation, but the Arctic coastal states have met several times on expert level to discuss fishing in the Arctic Ocean.

The US has been the most active in this process, with Denmark and Canada as supportive and with Norway and Russia as the most passive. The US proactive role might be a result of the experiences from the collapse of the fishing stock Bering Sea in the early 90.

The PEW Charitable Trust in the US has also been active in bringing this to the table. In Norwegian and Russian parts of the Arctic Ocean there are already large scale fishing taking place.

Among other actors are: Iceland, Finland, Sweden, EU, China and other Asian states.

The process between the Arctic coastal states started in Oslo in 2010 with the last being in Nuuk in February 2014. There the states agreed that there will be no fisheries until there is sufficient data. There may also be a declaration later this year which may include more states than the Arctic coastal states.

Although Norway is reluctant to use the word “moratorium” it does not mean that Norway is against regulation as Norway has a unilateral ban on fishing in unregulated waters.

Will the Arctic coastal states will continue to take the leadership. Will experimental fisheries be allowed? How do the indigenous peoples fishing (especially relevant for Canada) get included?

On questions from the Committee Mr. Wegge noted that migration and new migration patterns of fish stocks are normal, and often other species fill the void when one group leaves.

Mr. Wegge did not see the Permanent Participants becoming a part of the Arctic coastal states cooperation.

Finally Mr. Wegge noted that there are areas in the Arctic Ocean which is High Seas and still have shallow waters, but most of the area is very deep.

Decision:

The Committee took note of the information.

6. TOWARDS COOPERATION AND CAPACITY-BUILDING IN ARCTIC PUBLIC SAFETY

Mr. Kristian Sørby Kristensen, University of Copenhagen, introduced the Committee to the topic “Towards cooperation and capacity-building in Arctic public safety”.

Mr. Kristensen connected public safety and Arctic sovereignty and the political responsibility to provide public safety. He went on to distinguish between Arctic ownership and Arctic stewardship, where Arctic ownership is total and stewardship is more to manage the area through cooperation and obligations. With increasing activity comes more need stewardship and public safety management, which again should result in competence building measures. The two binding agreements between the Arctic states are on public safety.

Challenges for public safety building is that it is complex, has unknown elements and is costly. Complex organizations – nationally and internationally – can make the responsibility

unclear. There are differences between the Arctic nations in the organization of national safety, such as military and civilian Coast Guards. Complex national structures of responsibility makes international cooperation more challenging.

The local challenges in the Arctic are fragile, small settlements, with few people involved, little infrastructure and search capacity, far away and large distances.

Public safety is matter of sovereign obligations but fragmentations in national responsibility.

International cooperation must take place in the Arctic, but political will and resources must come from the nations. Cooperation between the states must needs to be established and institutionalized beforehand.

The military is an important capacity which needs to be included. The local population is first responders with potential valuable skills. Improving infrastructure improves public safety.

On question from the Committee the Mr. Kristensen noted that the level of capacity for safety in the Arctic must be a political decision based on scientific advices. He further went on the underline the importance of joint exercises and that the people who shall do the job know each other before an incident. He also underlined the need of knowledge exchange, not only information exchange.

Although the political attention to the need of search and rescue capability is large, the political will is less developed. It is an economic question and about international cooperation, but anyway the Arctic will continue to be dangerous and large.

The Russian delegation pointed to large investments planned and to some extent implemented along the Northern Sea Route, and that a new program on Arctic safety had recently been signed. President Putin met with business representatives in St. Petersburg to discuss Arctic shelf issues with emphasis on oil and gas explorations.

Mr. Kristensen further noted that satellite information sharing is an important factor in safety management. Finally he answered that it is central to address the right risk and that technological development, such as tracking devices, will play an important role in reducing risk.

The risk picture in the Arctic varies regionally and even locally as the nature and climate is different. Mapping of vulnerability could be better and would make communities more safe and resilient.

Decision:

7. CONFERENCE IN WHITEHORSE 9-11 SEPTEMBER 2014

The Canadian delegation presented the updated draft program to the Committee.

Preliminary reports were then presented from the rapporteurs.

Mr. Sivertsen noted that he will build on the conference statement from the Arctic which includes several articles on Arctic governance. In addition Mr. Sivertsen will look at how the view of the regional and local levels are brought into the Arctic cooperation, and how indigenous peoples are involved in national and international decision making in the Arctic countries.

Mr. Dennis Bevington will look at how infrastructure in the Arctic can be sustainably developed in a changing Arctic – taking into account the economic development and costs of living in the Arctic, energy infrastructure and promoting food security.

On behalf of Senator Murkowski Mr. Isaac Edwards reported that the focus will be on capacity multi environmental capacity and build on the report from the Committee on the same topic.

Members of the Committee underlined the importance to focus on prevention – both in the draft the draft conference statement and in the report on capacity building and economic development.

The need of regional cooperation on exchange of labour force was also put forward as an important issue to be included in the statement.

Finally a new article on the involvement of the permanent participants was presented.

Decision:

The Committee took note of the updates and the input from its members to the preparations for the conference in Whitehorse. Amendments to the conference statement must be sent to the Secretary General.

8. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND CAPACITY BUILDING IN THE NORTH

Members of the Committee wanted to expand the text on infrastructure, include the role of forest industry and the promotion of new technology.

Members of the Committee also wanted a clearer on the benefits when assessing the development of natural resources in the Arctic, and finally try to distinguish between “the Arctic” and “the High North” in the report,

Decision:

The Committee took note of the input and the Secretary General will include it into an updated draft of the report.

9. STATUS OF THE WORK OF SCPAR

Ms. Olsvig informed the Committee that she has been elected new Chair of her party, IA, and will need to give this work top priority. She will therefore retire from the Danish parliament and focus on her work as a member of the Greenlandic parliament and party Chair. Following from this Ms. Olsvig will step down as Chair of SCPAR at the meeting of the Standing Committee 10 September.

Ms. Olsvig also informed about the exchange of letters between her as Chair of SCPAR and the Arctic Council Chairmanship. The background for was a decision by the Canadian Chairmanship to reject a request from the Standing Committee to report on its activities at SAO meeting in Yellowknife in March 2014. This was the first time SCPAR was not given the opportunity to address a SAO meeting of the Arctic Council upon request.

Mr. Leef questioned the wording in the letter from the Chair of SCPAR and if it was wise to use the words “historic” and “disappointed”, and if it was factual correct that SCPAR had always been given the opportunity to address the SAO meetings.

Members of the Committee noted that it would be appropriate to address the need of a direct dialogue with the Arctic Council in the Conference Statement in the upcoming conference in Whitehorse.

Mr. Tumusov from the Russian delegation presented the project “The Family of the Arctic”.

2014 is the “Year of Culture” in Russia and the Sakha republic has named 2014 the “Year of the Arctic”. In this connection Mr. Tumusov has published a book “The Treasures of the North” which is about the people in the Arctic. The book was distributed to the members of the Committee.

The US reported that a Special Representative for the Arctic will most likely be named within the next few weeks.

A report from the US Government Accountability Office on the work of the Arctic Council, and follow up of the recommendations from the Council, was presented in May.

Norway reported about a successful visit to Oslo from the Arctic delegation in the Finnish parliament 5 May, and about an upcoming Arctic event in Arendal, Norway 15 August.

The West-Nordic Council has a new Secretary General Ms. Inga Dora Markussen, Greenland. The Council is working to establish the West Nordic area as a free trade economic zone, and welcomed the members of the Committee to the Arctic Circle in Reykjavik, 31 Oct – 2 November.

Indigenous Peoples Secretariat reported of a new director who will start working 1 September 2014. The IPS will move to Tromsø, probably next year, and will 1 November organize a conference celebrating the 20 years anniversary of IPS.

Saami Parliamentary Council will apply for observer status in the Arctic Council and membership in the Nordic Council.

There will be a preparatory meeting in the UN in advance of the World Conference on Indigenous Peoples, and they prepare input from Saami people in this process.

Nordic Council organized a thematic session in Akureyri on the sustainable utilization of natural resources where issues like environmental threats and search and rescue were discussed together with disagreements on fisheries such as herring and mackerel. The Nordic Council session will be in Stockholm in the end of October.

Sweden just had a debate on climate debate in the Plenary. There will a national election 14 September where environmental and climate issues are likely to be important, as they were in the European Parliament elections in Sweden.

Finland referred to the Arctic Science Summit which took place in Helsinki in late April and an event with the US Arctic Research Commission. The Finnish delegation visited Norway in May and will receive a delegation from Alaska next week.

Russia referred to the implementation of the plan for Arctic zone in Russia. Russian is also implementing a national system on prevention and the President is hosting a meeting on safety in the Arctic. The law regulating the different land - zones in Russia has recently been updated with an updated definition of what is the Arctic zone.

The Chair reported that she will attend three different meetings in the near future in her capacity as Chair: a meeting at "Oden" on the limits of the Arctic shelf 25 June, the ICC Congress in Inuvik 21-24 July and the Arctic meeting in Arendal 15 August.

Greenland has also started with scientific catch of mackerel in Greenlandic waters.

Canada wished the members of the Committee welcome to Whitehorse.

Decision:

The Committee took note of the information.

10. NEXT MEETINGS OF SCPAR

Whitehorse 9 September 2014 and 10 September 2014

Helsinki 19-21 November 2014 - including seminar on increased cooperation on security in the Arctic.

Decision:

The next meetings of SCPAR will be in Whitehorse 9 and 10 September and in Helsinki 19-21 November.

11. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

CONFERENCE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS OF THE ARCTIC REGION
THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS OF THE ARCTIC REGION
MEETING IN COPENHAGEN

10 -11 June 2014

List of participants

MEMBERS

Canada	Mr. Ryan Leef, MP Mr. Dennis Bevington, MP Mr. Tim Williams, Analyst, Parliamentary Information and Research Service, Library of Parliament
Denmark/Greenland	Ms. Sara Olsvig, MP Mr. Sjurður Skaale, MP Mr. Peder Pedersen, Head of Section Ms. Kamilla Kjølgaard, Adviser Ms. Jonna Sandø, International Secretary Ms. Anne-Kathrine B. Olsen, Adviser
Finland	Mrs. Johanna Ojala-Niemelä, MP Mr. Guy Lindström, Deputy Director, International Department
Iceland	Ms. Arna Bang, Adviser
Norway	Mr. Eirik Sivertsen, MP
Russia	Mr. Vladimir Torlopov, Senator, Head of the Russian Delegation Mr. Igor Chernyshenko - Senator Ms. Natalia Libinzon - Assistant to Senator Torlopov Mr. Fedot Tumusov, MP Ms. Irina Kuzmina, Secretary
Sweden	Ms. Anita Brodén, MP Ms. Eva Hjelm, Adviser
USA	Mr. Isaac Edwards, Adviser Ms. Susan Delja, US Embassy

PERMANENT PARTICIPANTS

Sámi Parliamentary Council	Mr. Håkan Jonsson, President Ms. Kristina Nordlig, Administrator
Indigenous Peoples Secretariat	Ms. Alona Yefimenko, Acting Executive Secretary

OBSERVERS

Nordic Council

Mr. Helgi Hjörvar, MP
Mr. Torkil Sørensen, Senior advisor
Mr. Sighvatur Hilmar Arnmundsson, Adviser

West-Nordic Council

Ms. Unnur Bra Konradsdóttir, MP
Ms. Inga Dora Markussen, Secretary General

SECRETARIAT

Mr. Bjørn Willy Robstad, Secretary General

INTERPRETERS

Ms. Alexandra Lööv
Mr. Sten Jacobsen

GUESTS

Mr. Martin Lidegaard, Minister of Foreign Affairs
Mr. Erik Vilstrup Lorentsen, Under-Secretary for Arctic Affairs,
Ambassador, MFA
Professor Minik Rosing, University of Copenhagen
Mr. Njord Wegge, Senior Research Fellow, PhD, Fridtjof Nansen
Institute, Norway
Mr. Kristian Sjøby Kristensen, Senior Researcher, University of
Copenhagen
Mr. Hrannar Arnarsson, Adviser, Nordic Council
Ms. Joan Ólavsdóttir, Adviser, Nordic Council
Arctic Council Chairmanship (2)

Travel Costs

ASSOCIATION	Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association
ACTIVITY	Meeting of the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region
DESTINATION	Copenhagen, Denmark
DATES	June 10-11, 2014
DELEGATION	
HOUSE OF COMMONS	Mr. Dennis Bevington, MP Mr. Ryan Leef, MP
STAFF	Mr. Tim Williams, Advisor
TRANSPORTATION	\$7,459.04
ACCOMMODATION	\$1,950.52
HOSPITALITY	\$-
PER DIEMS	\$1,529.51
OFFICIAL GIFTS	\$-
MISCELLANEOUS / REGISTRATION FEES	\$-
TOTAL	\$10,939.07