

Canada - Europe
Parliamentary Association



Association parlementaire
Canada - Europe

**Report of the Canadian Parliamentary Delegation
respecting its participation at the Ninth Conference of
Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region**

Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association

**Brussels, Belgium
September 13 to 15, 2010**

Report

Introduction

Mr. Steven Blaney led a delegation of two parliamentarians to the Ninth Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region in Brussels, Belgium, 13 to 15 September 2010. The other delegate was the Hon. Lawrence MacAulay, 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. Two meetings of the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region (SCPAR) were held in association with the Conference.

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

The Conference adopts a statement with recommendations to the Arctic Council 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 carried on by SCPAR, 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

Conference Proceedings

The Conference focuses on major themes that are introduced by keynote speakers. In addition, for the 9th Conference, SCPAR had named three rapporteurs to investigate the issues and report on them at the Conference. The themes for the 9th Conference were:

- Sustainable management of living resources in the Arctic, rapporteur: Ms Sofia Rossen, MP, Denmark/Greenland
- Cooperation in education and research - the legacy of IPY, rapporteur: Mr Morten Høglund, MP, Norway

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/>

- The melting ice – consequences, rapporteur: Mr Igor Chernyshenko, MP, State Duma, Russia

Various side events were also held in conjunction with the Conference to discuss the: European role and responsibility in the Arctic; a sustainable EU policy for the high north; the need for an EU Arctic Information Centre; the call for a moratorium on oil and gas exploration in the Arctic; and the EU role in Arctic science and education cooperation (a University of the Arctic mini seminar).

A. Opening Remarks

The president of the European Parliament, Jerry Buzek, greeted the conference via a tape-recorded message in which he stressed the need to look for solutions to address the consequences of a changing Arctic for the environment, maritime transport and fisheries. The overarching goal, in his opinion, was to leave behind to future generations the Arctic as it is today.

Ms Diana Wallis, Vice-President of the European Parliament, then opened the Conference with a call for continued cooperation and neighbourliness. The Arctic is at the eye of the storm of climate change and has attracted the interest of citizens. As representatives of the people, parliamentarians, particularly of the Conference, are very important, but need to be informed and educated along with the citizenry. There must be clear links between the parliamentary and governmental dimensions.

Pat the Cope Gallagher, chair of the delegation from the European Parliament, introduced the topics for the conference stating that the EU could be an important force in assisting those in the Arctic region.

Ms Maria Damanaki, European Commissioner for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, then gave a keynote address on Europe's interest in the Arctic, which was a theme reiterated at the conference. The EU has three Arctic states (including Denmark, though Greenland is not a member) and two others, Iceland and Norway, are within the European Economic Area. Because of climate change and its effects on transport and fisheries, European policy has a direct bearing on the Arctic while, in turn, the changes happening in the Arctic have globally significant consequences. The EU intends to lead the fight against climate change. In addition the EU is the largest seafood market in the world and has the largest merchant fleet. The Arctic policy is built on three axes: to protect and preserve the Arctic, enhance governance in the region and a priority of promoting sustainable use of resources. The EU also has a high commitment to Arctic research. The speech concluded with a quote:

“The fact that the Arctic, more than any other populated region of the world, requires the collaboration of so many disciplines and points of view to be

understood at all, is a benefit rather than a burden". Let us work together to ensure that this is true.³

Ms Lene Espersen, Chair of the Arctic Council, Danish Foreign Minister, then reported on the activities of the Arctic Council. She reiterated the mutual links between the Arctic and global climate change and the fact that it is climate change that has spawned the increasing interest in the Arctic. Solid scientific advice is required for rational decisions to be made. In the follow-up to the International Polar Year (IPY), scientists, decision makers and local peoples must work together. There are two major challenges facing the Arctic Council: how to accommodate observers and the functioning of the Council. With increased interest, more nations and organizations wish to be observers at the AC, however the required consensus has yet to be established. The standing and prestige of the AC is on the line. Denmark, for instance, would welcome the EU as an observer, but she asked the question as to whether the AC could bear the impact of many new observers. She suggested that the Senior Arctic Officials of the AC should solve the issue by their next meeting.

Mr Hannes Manninen, Chair of SCPAR, introduced the main functions of the Committee as being the implementation of the Conference Statement and the preparation of the next Conference. He stressed the close links between SCPAR and the Arctic Council, particularly with the chair. It was also noted that there was a special relationship with the University of the Arctic. Human health and living conditions are of primary importance SCPAR. Mr Manninen also commented on links between EU policies with Arctic elements and the work of the Committee, particularly noting the Northern Dimension policy on transport and logistics, the development of which SCPAR has followed on several occasions. He also stressed the importance of education and the role that the legacy of the IPY can play in improving and disseminating knowledge about the Arctic.

A discussion ensued focussing on the need for cooperation, particularly through a strengthened Arctic Council. The research community was highlighted as a model of broad-based interest and cooperation. While the AC was seen as the best organization at which such cooperation should take place, support for a permanent secretariat for the Council was suggested as a requirement to give it proper tools. It was suggested that there is a need for the AC to create a vision for the Arctic in 2030. Denmark (current AC chair) sees the increasing interest in the Arctic in a positive way and that part of strengthening the AC should include more observers. The possibility of making the AC into more of a political body with some decision making capacity was suggested and it was noted that deputy ministers were to have some political discussions about this subject. The Chair of SCPAR commented that the AC was the best organisation to achieve cooperation, not just the five coastal states, and that political leadership would be needed to achieve a vision for 2030.

³ Maria Damanaki, European Commissioner for Maritime Affairs and Fisheries, *"Arctic footsteps in Brussels" 9th Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region European Parliament, Brussels, 13 September 2010*, press release, 13 September 2009 (citing Bruce Jackson)
<http://europa.eu/rapid/pressReleasesAction.do?reference=SPEECH/10/422&format=HTML&aged=0&language=EN&guiLanguage=en>

The recent agreement between Russia and Norway regarding the Barents Sea was noted as a case in point of cooperation. Russia noted that when it planted a flag at the North Pole it was a sign of geological discovery, not a political move. Russia is very supportive of an International Polar Decade, and the International Maritime Organization also seems to be behind this concept. The EU Commission noted that the sighting of fish in northern waters, such as herring, was not as innocent as it seems, and that there was a need to avoid wars on quotas, for example. There needs to be parliamentary support for sustainable development of resources.

B. Sustainable management of living resources in the Arctic

Mr Erik Lahnstein, State Secretary to the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, introduced his remarks by stating that he was thrilled to see increasing attention paid to the Arctic and that the EU had a legitimate interest and could make a valuable contribution. There is a need for long term conservation based on robust knowledge. Mr. Lahnstein contrasted EU and Norwegian seafood production noting that while the EU production had dropped significantly, Norwegian production had increased slightly. While noting that this was partly due to environmental change, he attributed most of this difference to policies. It was suggested that a ban on discard of fish, a reduced fleet and regulations to protect small fish was necessary. Integrated management plans including minerals, petroleum, transportation and tourism, with input from indigenous people was necessary, since each affects the other. A holistic and precautionary approach was necessary, not to preserve the Arctic as a museum, but to manage the Arctic for the benefit of all mankind.

Mr Karl Falkenberg, Director-General, DG Environment, European Commission, stated that the EU places the environment at the heart of its considerations, but also that, first and foremost, the needs and role of the people of the Arctic need to be recognised. He noted the importance of research, stating that there was a need to move away from the precautionary principle by obtaining the knowledge needed for decisions to be made. He was “painfully aware” that, had different decisions been made regarding fish management in the past, harvests would be

better now. Regarding oil and gas, he stated that permits should only be given if there were proper preparations for accidents and that there had to be clear responsibility and liability. He commented that he appreciated the cooperation on the issue of whaling, where limited takings of humpback whales showed an understanding of the needs of local populations.

Ms Sofia Rossen, MP, Denmark/Greenland, and SCPAR rapporteur on this theme, then summarised her report.⁴ She noted that Arctic parliamentarians need to work in a transparent way to advance sustainable use of marine mammals based on knowledge, experience and responsibility. This could best be achieved through cooperation in:

- Research and knowledge

⁴ Sofia Rossen (Inuit Ataqatigiit) , *Report to SCPAR on sustainable use of living resources in the Arctic*, <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/arcticparl/Report%20to%20SCPAR%20on%20sustainable%20use%20of%20living%20resources.doc>

- Education
- Management and control
- Communication

Her recommendations in these areas included involving the University of the Arctic in establishing programmes and publishing results of research on marine mammals as well as working to increase cooperation between researchers and hunters.

In the discussion following these presentations, it was noted that, while integrated management was time consuming and expensive, it was necessary to educate all stakeholders toward greater common understanding and to make decisions more legitimate. It was mentioned that sustainable management was best achieved within a jurisdiction's own economic zones, noting for instance that the EU would require Iceland to abandon whaling for accession to the EU. Unique circumstances and international law must be taken into account. It was also noted that illegal fishing was a major problem and that there needed to be tough supervision of all ships flying flags of the EU both at sea and where catches are landed. As a result of climate change, fish are moving and regulations must move as well. But climate change is global and must be dealt with globally. Science and policy must "meet and shake hands." One intervention noted that there was a disturbing trend to ignore the need for global cooperation. Man-made borders do not coincide with ecosystems. Regarding Iceland accession, it was stated that if one wanted to join a soccer club, one didn't play by rugby rules.

A Canadian observer noted his agreement with Ms Rossen's paper. With respect to the AC, he noted that it was time for it to obtain a level of maturity including a secretariat and a more political role, and that search and rescue would be a good place to start. In this way it would become a good tool to assume leadership in the north.

C. Cooperation in education and research - the legacy of IPY

Mr Steven Blaney, MP, House of Commons, Canada, co-chaired this session with Ms Sinikka Bohlin, MP, Sweden. Mr Blaney, in a preamble to the topic, noted that, though Russia had placed a Russian flag on the North Pole in 2007, a team of Canadian scientists, working under the Canadian Polar Continental Shelf Project in 1967, had dropped a scientific instrument on the north pole. Before doing so, however, and convinced of the international importance of their work, they had applied to the instrument the flag of the United Nations Organization, the flags of all circumpolar nations including the USSR and Canada, and all the flags of member countries of the UN. Canadian scientists, therefore, had placed these flags, representing the circumpolar world and the international community, on the sea bed of the North Pole 40 years before the Russians planted their flag for the second time.

Mr Lars Kullerud, President of the University of the Arctic (UArctic), noted that UArctic is a child of CPAR and parliamentarians. It has 130 member institutions with 150 000 students who, while not all in Arctic studies, represent a fantastic opportunity. He posed the question as to who is it that can identify research projects, noting the work of the

International Arctic Science Committee and the International Conference on Arctic Research Planning. He encouraged the science community and northern communities to identify issues that need to be addressed. He also stated the importance of moving people north to experience it, but also mentioned that the UArctic “Go North” program, which does this, needs more investment.

Dr. Joan Nymand Larsen, Senior Scientist, Stefansson Arctic Institute, stressed the need for the participation of regional communities and aboriginal peoples as full partners in collaborative research. While in the past research had been burdened by the physical sciences, the IPY had helped to remedy this by including a social dimension. Access to data is a central question and one that could be addressed with an IPY legacy of improved monitoring and data management. Dr. Larsen also noted the Icelandic efforts toward a second Arctic Human Development Report as an example of international research collaboration.

Mr Morten Høglund, MP, Norway, and SCPAR rapporteur on this theme,⁵ emphasized that the focus should be on education for Arctic peoples so as to put their interests first. IPY has created momentum and the IPY conference to be held in Montreal, Canada in 2012 will be a good chance to move forward on this issue. He also noted the importance of both social and natural sciences that should be part of a new way of conducting scientific research that should be led by Arctic countries. Mr. Høglund remarked upon the fact that there were world class scientists at the Conference to discuss issues with politicians, and that business would also be required to innovate toward sustainable development. He concluded by emphasizing that science is needed.

Mr Robert-Jan Smits, Director-General, DG Research, European Commission summarized the importance of the Commission to Arctic research, noting that, not including member-state contributions, the Commission had spent € 200 million over ten years including support for the Arctic component of the Global Earth Observation System of Systems and the building of the German ice breaker Aurora Borealis. There is a need to share data and join forces in Arctic research. He noted that there was still much we don't fully understand and a need to learn a lot more.

The discussion opened with a reminder that it is necessary to take into account the traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples as well as their rights, including the concept of education as a human right. Education should respect indigenous peoples' cultures. The question was raised as to why more students in the Arctic do not go abroad on exchange programs. There could also be more use of technology in education and research networks. A Canadian delegate intervened to lend support to the idea of working toward a strengthened Arctic Council by working toward greater policy dialogue and engaging other member states in examining the structural needs of the Council, including a possible secretariat. It was again reiterated that there was a need for carefully balanced decision- making based on both social and natural science. An intervener suggested that there was no longer a “state” of the Arctic, only change. It was necessary to identify root causes of this change (climate or other) and to build resilience

⁵ Morten Høglund, *Arctic cooperation in education and research – follow-up of the International Polar Year*, <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/arcticparl/Report%20Mr%20%20Morten%20Hoglund%20SCPAP.doc>

in the north to these changes. It was noted that students were the most important resources as it is they that will replace “us”. Creating and funding mobility of students was seen as important. Funding education was seen as key to the empowerment of the Arctic.

The panel responded initially by noting the importance of data exchange and how this could be improved upon by creating relevant standards such as archiving using common data protocols as well as improving translation. Timely access to data could be facilitated by rewarding researchers for making data public before it is published, which can take years. Applying southern data protocols on the north was seen as a problem to avoid. Funding directed at institutions sometimes means that those without access to the institutions are ignored. It was noted that the UArctic, while not perfect, did have a vice-president of indigenous affairs. The IPY also included some projects that were lead by indigenous peoples. It is important to identify obstacles to student exchange and learn from best practices. Meetings with scientists, educators and parliamentarians, such as this Conference and previous meetings between SCPAR and the UArctic rectors, were seen as very valuable. It was also thought that the IPY had been a tremendous success and it was mentioned that perhaps sometimes scientists were ahead of populations.

D. The melting ice – consequences

Mr Igor Chernyshenko, MP, State Duma, Russia, and SCPAR rapporteur on this theme, summarized some of the facts surrounding the melting Arctic ice. Each summer brings new record temperatures with perennial ice reduced to 15% of the ocean in 2004-2005. He noted that the IPY had been an unprecedented effort to study the Arctic including many cooperative efforts such as those including Denmark, Sweden and Poland as well as others on a drifting icebreaker. Although there is much negative in the forecast he noted some positives. Some examples included: reducing the risks involved in oil and gas exploration; potential improvements in fishing; and tourism and agriculture. Negatives include sea level rise, melting permafrost, threats to mammals such as seals and the polar bear. Regarding sea level rise he noted that the most accepted prediction of a 1.5 to 2 m rise would result in 15% of the global population being flooded as well as close to \$ (US) 1000 billion in damages. Some of the burning issues relate to oil and gas exploration and transportation. However, he reiterated that these would be developed according to UNCLOS. The Russian UNCLOS claim to an extended continental shelf would be soon supported by a 2 week study using a nuclear icebreaker. However, he noted that claims were complicated by the fact that the US had not ratified UNCLOS. Mr Chernyshenko noted that Russia was already using the Arctic for shipping, both across the Baltic-Russia-China (Northern Sea Route, NSR) route as well as across to Churchill Manitoba, Canada. Trips from Rotterdam to China were 45% cheaper than the Panama Canal and there is greatly reduced risk of piracy. He noted that the NSR is very important to Russia and a key to the survival of northern peoples. Setting up the infrastructure for the NSR is a significant part of Russia’s Arctic policy. He also referred to Article 234 of UNCLOS (Ice-Covered Areas) which gives coastal states the right to “adopt and enforce non-discriminatory laws and regulations

for the prevention, reduction and control of marine pollution from vessels in ice-covered areas within the limits of the exclusive economic zone.” He concluded noting various efforts to avoid accidents including Russian efforts at the G-20 and the possibility of 10 centres in Russia to prevent “technogenic” disasters. The AC and the Barents Euro-Arctic Council were also mentioned as important bodies in international cooperation to reduce the potential for disasters.

Ms Jacqueline McGlade, Executive Director, European Environment Agency, initiated her intervention by explaining why, with five Arctic states the Arctic is relevant to the Agency and how it tries to convey to the Mediterranean states the message that the Arctic is relevant to other states. Climate change has unknown implications with the speed particularly up to question. She noted that sea ice is important to such fundamental organisms as algae. Research must be sustained and nations must share data. She noted that climate change was a legacy of the developed world but with biodiversity the developing world must maintain it as well, the equity question for the two conventions was different. The EU is proud of its environmental regulation with industry under strict regulation. She noted that the EU footprint was in the Arctic, for instance in the body-burden of toxic chemicals. There is a duty of care for the small number of people affected. While the AC is special and strong, addressing problems such as emissions from bunker fuel requires greater international cooperation. A commitment is necessary to continue monitoring because we can't rely on history to tell us the future. Sharing data is necessary because the evidence must be seen to support evidence-based policy making. It is possible to make a commitment to exchange information while respecting sovereignty.

Mr Per Sønderstrup, Head of Centre for Maritime Regulation, Danish Maritime Authority, described some of the issues surrounding shipping in the Arctic. A large megacontainer ship requires 60m of depth meaning that there is an absolute requirement for deep water. There are 40 000 km of coastline in Greenland and in 2008 there were 44 larger ships in these waters. Cruise ships with 15 000 passengers were the most common ships showing interest in the area. While the NSR, Northwest Passage and transpolar routes would save many nautical miles they are not adequately surveyed, have extreme weather and limited infrastructure, search and rescue and pollution control capacity. The accident of the MV Clipper Adventurer was noted as an example of cruise ships requiring rescue capacity. It was suggested that cruise ships be paired in the Arctic region as most communities do not have the capacity to accommodate that number of people. Proactive action is needed to make rules mandatory. International rules are needed because the ships' registration, ownership and operators can all be from different countries. A risk based approach is needed where the risks are analysed and acted upon.

Mr Henrik Falck, Project Manager - Eastern Europe, Tschudi Shipping Company, Norway, noted that Russia was at the centre of current energy and resource development in the north. The drivers behind this are increased commodity prices, diminished ice, technological change and Russian interest in development. He mentioned some of the activities that are occurring, including mining and oil and gas. Mr. Falck noted that his company was the first international company to gain approval and use the NSR. A shipment of iron ore left Kirkenes, Norway to China with an

estimated savings of 10-15 days. The MV Nordic Barents sailed on 4 September, accompanied by a Russian nuclear icebreaker, with a load of 40 000 tonnes of iron ore. He also mentioned that a possible alternative to the NSR would be to use the Russian river system, an idea that Jonas Lied had 100 years ago. His conclusion was that the NSR was ready, but the world's commercial fleet was not.

During the discussion it was noted that cruise ships were a particular problem with ships that are not built for Arctic circumstances and have crews that lack experience. Work is underway to implement the Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment recommendation to make mandatory relevant aspects of the IMO's Arctic Guidelines. In addition, a mandatory agreement negotiated under the AC on search and rescue is imminent. It was emphasized that accidents are waiting to happen and it is urgent that these issues be addressed. The Conference ended with approval of the Conference Statement (see Appendix). The next Conference will be hosted by the Icelandic Parliament in 2012.

The Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region

The Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region met three times in conjunction with the Conference, two prior and once after. The first was a short meeting to summarize the upcoming conference. The second meeting was to begin a conversation with observers to SCPAR. Observers present represented the Arctic Governance Project, the International Arctic Science Committee, the Northern Research Forum, the University of the Arctic and the AC Indigenous Peoples Secretariat.⁶

The meeting after the Conference focussed on a suggestion to ensure that the chair of SCPAR rotates between member countries as well as how to involve the members in sharing of SCPAR responsibilities. It was agreed that it would be best to rotate the chair, however, a flexible mechanism must be found given the parliamentary instability in some countries. It was noted that the use of rapporteurs had been very successful. A Canadian delegate noted that at home there was no dedicated position to Arctic issues under the Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association, which is where parliamentary participation in SCPAR is housed. Having a rotating chair could raise the profile of SCPAR domestically, but it was premature to make such a decision. Discussions on the role of a vice-chair were held over until the next meeting. Norway stated that it was willing continue to provide the secretary general to SCPAR. It was decided that Finland would continue in the chair.

⁶ The Arctic Governance Project, <http://www.arcticgovernance.org/>
International Arctic Science Committee, <http://web.arcticportal.org/iasc/>
Northern Research Forum, <http://www.nrf.is/>
University of the Arctic, <http://www.uarctic.org/Frontpage.aspx?m=3>
Indigenous Peoples Secretariat, <http://ips.arcticportal.org/>

The next meeting of SCPAR will be in Ottawa, Canada, 16 November 2010.

Respectfully submitted,

Mr. Steven Blaney, M.P.
Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association

Appendix

Ninth Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, European Parliament,
Brussels 13-15 September 2010



CONFERENCE STATEMENT

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

In collaboration with the indigenous peoples of the Arctic;

Meeting to discuss the sustainable use of living resources in the Arctic, cooperation in education and research – the legacy of IPY, and the consequences of the melting ice;

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

Ask the governments in the Arctic Region, the Arctic Council and the institutions of the European Union:

Regarding the sustainable management of living resources in the Arctic, to

1. Create mechanisms that emphasize ecosystem-based management and extended environmental impact assessment procedures, as well as social impacts, on an Arctic-wide basis.
2. Establish Arctic cooperation on the management of living resources in the Arctic, and formulate a common set of goals and interests.
3. Examine what sort of practical hunting and fisheries education exists in the Arctic, and facilitate a closer cooperation between research institutions and hunting organizations in the Arctic region.
4. Commission the University of the Arctic to strengthen education, including traditional knowledge, related to the sustainable hunting of marine mammals and establish a network between educational institutions in this field, as well as increase the number of grants to PhD fellowships and research into marine mammals.

5. Collect and share data on new and emerging fisheries within their exclusive economic zones toward ensuring sustainable development of those fisheries and to work towards consistency of approaches and standards for managing transborder stocks.

6. Strengthen the cooperation of the circumpolar reindeer herders' network, including the IPY legacy, the University of the Arctic Institute for Circumpolar Reindeer Husbandry, as reindeer as a species and their grazing lands have a special significance for human life and the economy in the Arctic.

Regarding cooperation in education and research, and the follow-up of the International Polar Year, to

7. Enhance Arctic research and education programs for circumpolar projects with the possibility for non-Arctic countries to participate.

8. Implement agreements and share information between the Arctic countries and other interested nations that secure access to research data and information about the Arctic.

9. Secure long-term monitoring of development in the Arctic and support the Sustaining Arctic Observing Networks (SAON) process.

10. Arrange a meeting between the ministers responsible for research in Arctic countries and the ministers from countries participating in the International Polar Year, if possible in conjunction with the IPY Conference in Montreal 22-27 April 2012, in order to promote mutually beneficial interaction between the science and policy communities.

11. Assess the IPY results and, together with scientific organizations, develop a document for decision-makers of emerging key research findings, and promote consultations on the proposal for an International Polar Decade.

12. Provide easy access to the results of IPY for researchers, decision-makers and the general public.

13. Move forward on the plans by the European Commission to set up an EU Arctic Information Centre, taking note of the idea to set up such a centre as a network with a hub at the Arctic Centre of the University of Lapland, Finland, and cooperating with relevant research institutions.

14. Strengthen existing mobility and exchange programs to increase circumpolar mobility as well as "Go North" mobility for students from southern locations as a focused means to secure international cooperation, integration, and the development of future polar scientists.

15. Connect the science community and the business sector in order to use the results from polar research to create new jobs in the Arctic region, particularly for those already living there.

16. Further develop and continue partnerships and general dialogue with local and indigenous communities in business development, knowledge development, IPY legacies and democracy building in the Arctic.

17. Continue to provide programs to encourage interdisciplinary research cooperation in the Arctic.

Regarding consequences of the melting ice in the Arctic, to

18. Conclude the agreement on search and rescue and increase capacity in the Arctic Region in order to ensure the appropriate response to possible accidents as the Arctic opens up to marine shipping.

19. Strengthen existing measures and develop new measures to improve the safety of maritime navigation, in particular through the International Maritime Organization and its ongoing work, notably in the development of a compulsory Polar Code.

20. Implement the recommendations of the Arctic Council's Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment.

21. Raise a strong Arctic message to combat climate change at the COP 16 negotiations in Mexico 2010.

22. Enhance efforts to prevent and mitigate climate change and its consequences for Arctic populations and wildlife habitats.

23. Continue to improve the assessment of the environmental, societal and economic consequences of natural resources' exploration and extraction.

24. Support the Icelandic initiative toward a second Arctic Human Development Report in 2014, bringing together state-of-the-art knowledge from the IPY that covers Arctic societies and their welfare in a global context.

Ask the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, to

25. Engage in the preparation of the next Conference of the International Polar Year in Canada in April 2012 and actively participate in the Conference.

26. In cooperation with University of the Arctic strengthen the open dialogue between the science community and political leadership in the circumpolar north.

27. Ask the University of the Arctic in cooperation with organisations like IASSA and IASC increasingly to publish Arctic relevant knowledge in reviewed academic journals, with a focus on marine mammals.

28. Promote the Statement from the Ninth Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region in the development of an Arctic policy in the European Union and the Arctic states, and involve all the member parliaments in this process.

29. Encourage member parliaments to organize conferences and public consultation exercises on the sustainable management of living resources in the Arctic that involve the participation and contributions of fishermen, hunters, reindeer herders, scientists, politicians and other interested parties.

Furthermore the Conference

30. Asks the Arctic Council and Arctic governments to establish a panel to provide an assessment on how the Arctic nations can prepare for new opportunities and challenges as a result of a changing Arctic, and on the basis of such a study, create a vision for the Arctic in 2030. The panel should include representatives of the science community, parliamentarians, business community and indigenous peoples' organizations.

31. Asks the Arctic states to arrange an Arctic Summit at the level of heads of state and government to show leadership and promote the Arctic region as an area of peaceful development and cooperation.

32. Supports the Arctic Council as the primary forum for Arctic cooperation, and encourages the Arctic Council to arrange annual ministerial meetings in to strengthen its legal and economic base, and to establish a permanent secretariat for the Council.

33. Calls on the partners of the Northern Dimension Policy and the Barents Euro-Arctic Council, as well as the other structures of cooperation in the Northern Dimension region, to actively implement the policy in the Arctic, and especially to include the Arctic in the new efforts to develop logistics and transportation, environmental policies, as well as to promote cultural exchange.

34. Takes note of the EU's efforts to develop an Arctic Policy and encourages the Arctic Council to consider granting the EU Commission permanent observer status in the Council in order to strengthen cooperation between the Council and the European Union.

35. Supports an active dialogue between Arctic and non-Arctic states in order to increase awareness among the general public as well as governments of the Arctic and its importance, not only regionally but globally.

36. Encourage the European Commission and Arctic governments to have effective dialogue with Arctic indigenous peoples on matters concerning them.

37. Acknowledges the interest and presence of parliamentary observers and representatives from governments and non-government agencies at this Conference, and recognizes their important role in relaying the messages and supporting the actions herein discussed.

38. Welcomes the forthcoming Swedish Chairmanship of the Arctic Council and looks forward to continued cooperation with the Arctic Council.

39. Welcomes and accepts the kind invitation of the Parliament of Iceland to host the tenth Conference in 2012.

Travel Costs

ASSOCIATION	Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association
ACTIVITY	Ninth Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region
DESTINATION	Brussels, Belgium
DATES	September 13 to 15, 2010.
DELEGATION	
SENATE	
HOUSE OF COMMONS	Mr. Steven Blaney, M.P. Hon. Lawrence MacAulay, C.P., M.P.
STAFF	Mr. Tim Williams, Analyst
TRANSPORTATION	\$ 13,702.25
ACCOMMODATION	\$ 2,881.51
HOSPITALITY	\$ 0.00
PER DIEMS	\$ 1,164.93
OFFICIAL GIFTS	\$ 0.00
MISCELLANEOUS / REGISTRATION FEES	\$ 26.86
TOTAL	\$17,775.55