

Canada - Europe
Parliamentary Association



Association parlementaire
Canada - Europe

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

Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association

**Akureyri, Iceland
September 5 to 7, 2012**

Report

INTRODUCTION

Senator Percy E. Downe led a delegation of four parliamentarians to the 10th Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region in Akureyri, Iceland, 5-7 September, 2012. The delegation was comprised of Senator Nancy Ruth, Mr. Larry Miller and Mr. Dennis Bevington. 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 (CPAR) is a parliamentary body consisting of 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 Ninth Conference was held in Brussels Belgium, 13 - 15 September 2010.¹ The Conference adopts a statement with recommendations to the Arctic Council and to the governments of the eight Arctic states and the European Commission.

Between conferences, Arctic parliamentary cooperation is carried on by SCPAR, which began its activities in 1994. The SCPAR closely monitors how the governments implement the Conference Statement, and undertakes new initiatives to further Arctic cooperation. The Conference and Standing Committee assume initiatives to further Arctic cooperation, and, in particular, act 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 PROCEEDINGS

The main body of the conference was separated into four parts, beginning with opening remarks and an overall discussion of issues on the agenda. This was followed by three sessions on the following topics:

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

¹ See the Conference Report, Ninth Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, European Parliament, Brussels 13-15 September 2010.

² Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region.

Speakers addressed each topic, followed by discussion.³ The SCPAR had appointed three members to research the topics and prepare papers summarizing their findings with recommendations. Each of these rapporteurs presented their papers to the conference, along with experts in the field.

A. Opening Session

The Speaker of the Icelandic parliament, H.E. Mrs. Ásta R. Jóhannesdóttir, opened the Tenth Conference by noting that the CPAR is an excellent example of parliamentary cooperation. Specifically, she remarked that many such parliamentary bodies are created after a related intergovernmental body is formed, but in the case of CPAR, it predated the formation of the Arctic Council by three years and was instrumental in pushing for the Council's formation.

The co-chair of the conference, Gudfrídur Lilja Gretarsdóttir, MP, Iceland, commented on Iceland's recovery since the economic downturn. She stressed that the success of the conference would be achieved through putting actions the conference discussed into place, so that parliamentarians would make a difference.

The mayor of Akureyri emphasized that though the city is small, it has over 7 000 students and its university housed the secretariats for two of the Arctic Council's working groups.

In his opening statement, Mr. Össur Skarphéðinsson, Icelandic Minister for Foreign Affairs, noted the links between the Arctic and the lives of its inhabitants, as recounted in the case of his nation as far back as the Icelandic sagas. He remarked that for better or worse there would always be change, in particular referring to how natural resources will be exploited. He discussed the Arctic Council's evolution toward having a stronger operating framework and supported the idea put forward at the conference to make the Arctic Council a treaty-based organization. In addition, he noted three other issues facing the Arctic Council, namely:

1. The development of a separate political statement being undertaken for the Kiruna ministerial meeting (Spring 2013) regarding a vision for the Arctic Council;
2. The need to map gaps in infrastructure and capacity in search and rescue; and
3. The importance of reaching a decision regarding a consensus on observers at the Arctic Council.

He concluded by stressing the importance of caring for and strengthening the Arctic Council.

Mr. Gustaf Lind, Senior Arctic Official Chair, Sweden, reported on the activities of the Arctic Council, noting that the current record sea ice melt was a call to action for the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, as well as action against black carbon and other short lived climate forcing agents. He emphasized the work under the Arctic Council to protect the environment from oil spills, as well as the assessments on biodiversity, the oceans and ocean acidification. He noted it was important to work toward better living conditions in the Arctic, including food and water

³ Discussion remarks throughout this report are not attributed and do not represent a consensus of the CPAR.

security. He also remarked on the work toward a vision for the Arctic occurring under the Swedish chairmanship, noting that it had been inspired by the 2010 CPAR statement which asked the Arctic Council and Arctic governments to create a vision for the Arctic in 2030.⁴ He closed by stating that it was also important for Sweden to work with Canada during the transition to the new chair, which Canada will assume starting in 2013.

Mr. Morten Høglund, Chair of SCPAR, Norway, reported on the work of the SCPAR, particularly regarding arctic governance. The Standing Committee had just that morning delivered a paper entitled *Arctic Governance in an Evolving Arctic Region* (Appendix I), upon which it had been deliberating for almost two years. In recommending a stronger Arctic Council, specifically for it to become a treaty-based organization, SCPAR was emphasizing the need to translate all of the good work of the Arctic Council into action, and to maintain decision-making with respect to the Arctic within the Arctic countries, even as more countries show their interest in the Arctic and become observers to the Arctic Council. He stressed that it was a forward-looking report and thanked the work of Clifford Lincoln in its development. In addition, Mr. Høglund emphasized the importance that the SCPAR places on circumpolar cooperation in education, remarking on the important role of the University of the Arctic in this area. He closed by stating his opinion that the SCPAR was not like other observers to the Arctic Council because it comprises elected officials from the Arctic region.

Senator Vladimir Torlopov, Head of Delegation, Council of Federation, Russia, greeted the CPAR stating that, because it comprised parliamentarians, it had the creativity to address the challenges facing the Arctic.

Discussion arose regarding the need to better communicate the work of the Arctic Council and the needs of the people of the Arctic. This would help to counter the misunderstanding, and dominant perception, that international competition was transforming the Arctic. Rather, a great level of cooperation is occurring in the region. It was noted that a paper on a strategic communication plan was being developed for the Arctic Council. It was also emphasized that communicating how people live was also a challenge, particularly with regard to their reliance on living resources such as whales and seals. A member from the European Parliament stressed the importance of including the European Union as an observer given its importance to global issues and its financial contribution to the Arctic region. The need to be patient on the issue of the seal ban was also noted, and the need to communicate the impact of the ban. The significance of supporting Indigenous peoples in the face of large corporations and development was discussed, with the need to strengthen the role of Indigenous peoples within the business community being stressed. It was noted that business was not represented at the Arctic Council discussions.

B. Arctic Governance and the Arctic Council

Mr. Clifford Lincoln, former MP and former Chair of the SCPAR, Canada, and original author of the draft of the paper *Arctic Governance in an Evolving Arctic Region* opened the discussion on Arctic Governance by recounting how he had helped to negotiate a

⁴ Conference Statement, Ninth Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, European Parliament, Brussels 13-15 September 2010, paragraph 30.

land management plan for a First Nation in Canada. A pilot area of land was set aside and was split into regions marked for easy development; more rigorous conditions for development; and, no development, designated green, orange and red respectively. He used this as a starting point to discuss the importance of creating a vision for the sustainable development of the Arctic, including a strengthened Arctic Council, which was easy to understand and communicate. He also referred to Switzerland's efforts to manage their alpine ecosystems as the "roof of Switzerland", in the same manner the Arctic is the indispensable roof of the planet. Making the Arctic Council a treaty organization with a vision would give it a more potent place in the international world to help preserve the Arctic as a region for the sake of the people that live there.

Ms. Ann-Kristin Johansson, MP, Sweden, and SCPAR rapporteur on Arctic governance summarized the paper (Appendix I) accepted at the morning meeting of SCPAR.

Dr. Valur Ingimundarson, Professor, University of Iceland, gave his independent views of the Arctic Council and some of the problematic issues that it was not discussing, namely fisheries and security. Though some had complained that the meetings of the five Arctic coastal states⁵ were a challenge to the Arctic Council, the Council had actually since strengthened. Though the Search and Rescue (SAR) agreement⁶ was given as evidence of this strengthened Council, he also noted that it was not very ambitious and could have been written a long time ago. Regarding fisheries he noted that scientists were calling for a moratorium on commercial fisheries in the Arctic while the Arctic Council was not discussing the issue. Nor was it discussing security; the SAR was a "soft security" issue and he stressed that, for the benefit of all security must be discussed. He also felt that the impact of potentially increased numbers of observers at the Council on Indigenous participation was overblown and was standing in the way of decisions. He finished by citing an article in Economist magazine which stated: "The message is clear: welcome to the new world of the warming Arctic. But remember who runs it."⁷

The following discussion included a wide range of views, from possible moratoria on development to give hope to the next generation, to the reality of a race for resources and an acknowledgment that hard security is expressly excluded by the Arctic Council's founding documents. The concept of integrated management was discussed, stressing that a well-managed area reduces risk of conflict. It was noted that while it was an interesting idea to denote areas where resource could not be developed, that this would impinge on the quality of life of Indigenous people. If they cannot exploit natural resources and cannot sell the products of living natural resources, what are they to live on? A Canadian delegate noted that there was a lot of conflicting interests in the Arctic that arouse strong emotional responses. He stressed the need for collaboration on research to supply the answers to important questions. With so much attention and so many conflicting values centred on the Arctic, it was important for the conference to send a message of progressive cooperation to the world.

C. Economic Opportunities in the Arctic

⁵ The "Arctic Five," (Canada, Denmark, Norway, Russia and the United States), met most notably in Ilulissat Greenland in May 2008 at which the Ilulissat declaration was signed.

⁶ *Agreement on Cooperation on Aeronautical and Maritime Search and Rescue in the Arctic*

⁷ "Cosy amid the thaw: The Arctic Council works well—because of the region's riches," *The Economist*, March 24, 2012.

Mr. Larry Miller, MP, Canada co-chaired this session with Ms Ann-Kristin Johansson, MP, Sweden.

Senator Lisa Murkowski, U.S. Senate discussed a wide range of issues regarding economic development, including the need for navigation aids and the state of U.S. ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. In her opinion there might be a window after the U.S. election during which ratification might be possible. The senator also stressed that since living resources such as whales define Indigenous communities and subsistence living was a necessary part of life in remote communities, any potential development must take this into consideration.

Ms. Johanna Ojala-Niemelä, MP, Finland and rapporteur for SCPAR, noted that the respective national Arctic strategies of Arctic nations include many similarities. They emphasize the use of natural resources, energy, tourism as well as new technology, and they consider developing infrastructure and transportation important. With interest in the Arctic growing she felt that it was important that the Arctic Council remains open to the outside world and allows non-Arctic states to make a constructive contribution to its work. Regarding sustainable development, she noted that the application of ecosystem based management and strategic environmental assessment were important. Education and research are also vital. Improved east-west and north-south transport will be beneficial. Having commonly accepted rules or guidelines for marine transport will be needed. The SCPAR supports the recommendations of the Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment⁸ and supports increased efforts to establish a mandatory polar code for shipping under the International Maritime Organization.⁹ Guidelines were also stressed as necessary for oil and gas exploitation. As for energy sources in the Arctic, replacement of fossil fuels in the region by solar, wind, biomass and other alternative energy sources suitable for the region should be underlined. Tourism and mining were also discussed. A common theme that emerged was that development of these industries must benefit the people who live in the Arctic. Swedish efforts to focus on guidelines of corporate social responsibility were highlighted.

Mr. Michael Slipenchuk, MP, Russia stated that some reaction to the planting of the Russian flag at the north pole was overblown and that it was not a sign of ownership, and after all, the U.S. planted a flag on the moon and no one thought that this has been a symbol of ownership. He commented on climate change being natural and went on to stress the importance of the Northern Sea Route to Russia and the need for infrastructure.

Two people from the shipping industry then described the relevance of Arctic shipping. Mr. Tero Vauraste, President and CEO of Arctia Shipping Ltd. stressed the strategic importance of icebreakers, however, their expense requires public private partnerships to decrease the burden on national taxes. Mr. Felix Tschudi, Chairman of Tschudi Shipping Co. described the use of the Northern Sea Route to save time. An 8-day savings of US \$200 000 per day could be expected. Factors controlling the use of the route include climate change, technology, active interest in developing the route from Russia, and high commodity prices. However, he also stressed that a possible polar

⁸ Arctic Council, *Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment 2009 report*, 2009.

⁹ See: International Maritime Organization, *Protecting the Polar regions from shipping, protecting ships in Polar waters*.

code with mandatory requirements for the use of diesel over heavy fuel oil would kill the route entirely.

The discussion initially centred on a call for a moratorium on oil and gas and mining, given that no country would act if others did not. However, others noted that Russia and Norway were already dependent on oil and gas and it was impossible to ask them to reduce their standards of living. What other opportunities existed for the people of the Arctic if oil and gas exploitation were not allowed and living resources were banned as commodities? It was remarked that economic development and environmental protection should not be seen as a balance but needed to be integrated. Caution should be used and more expensive technology applied given that the people, the Conference in particular, were signalling that the Arctic is special. Other instances of pollution control (such as catalytic converters in automobiles) had also been opposed based on unfounded potential economic impacts. Others noted that there might be too much emphasis on oil and gas and that more attention should be paid to improve cooperation on fisheries management. Technology and good, or best, practice sharing was seen as key. Industry should adhere to standards more stringent than regulation and if a project was too expensive perhaps it should be revisited.

D. Human Development in the Arctic: Interplay of Research, Authorities and Residents

Ms. Sara Olsvig, MP, Denmark/Greenland stressed the importance of the human dimension of development. The well-being of people of the North have always been central to the SCAPR. The primary factor is to ensure that the peoples of the Arctic are not undermined. The research summarized in the Arctic Human Development (AHDR) report was valuable and she looked forward to the second AHDR. Arctic peoples are resilient and change natural, but rapid change in small communities can be unhealthy. Protecting humans and the environment is not a contest, but emphasis on capacity building, education, mental health, human rights and gender equality is needed. Major projects should not be a new form of colonization. It was legitimate to ask whether or not oil and gas exploitation and mining were necessary, but alternatives should be sought without limiting the right of peoples of the north to determine their own destinies. Decisions on what, when and how development will occur must be founded in facts and knowledge. The Arctic people and peoples are part of a globalized world, their rights must be respected and they must be responsible for decisions making. She concluded with a quote from Albert Camus: "Don't walk behind me; I may not lead. Don't walk in front of me; I may not follow. Just walk beside me and be my friend."

Mr. Larry Miller and Mr. Dennis Bevington, MPs, Canada, gave a joint intervention on this subject. Mr. Miller noted that Canada plays a leading role in the Arctic and this will be especially true as it takes over the chairmanship of the Arctic Council in 2013, for which the Honourable Leona Aglukkaq, Minister of Health will be chair. The north is a fundamental part of Canadian heritage and identity. As such Canada introduced its Northern Strategy in 2009 with four pillars:

- Exercising our Arctic Sovereignty;
- Promoting Social and Economic Development;

- Protecting our Environmental Heritage; and
- Improving and Devolving Northern Governance.¹⁰

He remarked that he believed that the Arctic Council should be at the forefront of opposing bans on seal products and that this statement should be backed up with action. The North should not be a playground for the South. We should all work toward a healthy and prosperous North.

Mr. Bevington's intervention stressed that human development and research go hand in hand, but that it had so far not played out well. The North is a difficult environment yet has sustained humans for millennia. Such resilience is clear, but research can help modern societies as they adapt to current changes. However, such research must include the people of the North. He asked the question as to whether people might be trapped by resource development being carried out by others. He noted in particular a collaborative research effort in Canada to examine how Canadians living in northern communities can benefit from the sustainable development of the Arctic's natural resources in a manner that improves northerners' health and well-being, while preserving the region's unique environment.¹¹ Parliamentarians should be made aware of its results. In addition, the importance of sources of energy in the north was emphasized. Prices were dropping and technologies were advancing so fast that policy-based research cannot keep up, particularly noting that solar installations were now cheaper than diesel. Research was needed on energy storage. He also noted that it was his belief that the CPAR had become stronger over the years, with this strength being driven by the rapid changes occurring in the Arctic.

Dr. Joan Nyman-Larsen, Senior Scientist, Stefansson Arctic Institute, introduced the work being undertaken toward a second AHDR. Noting that the first report concluded that people are resilient but that change was very rapid, he stated that the summary of the first report is feeding into the second report. Among new topics to be considered for inclusion in the AHDR-II are: Globalization and the Arctic; Climate Change in the Arctic; Migration and Urbanization in the Arctic; Language Change and Revitalization; and Issues of Inequality.¹² Its guiding questions are:

- How does the Arctic differ from the outside world and especially from the metropolises or heartlands of the Arctic states?
- How much variance is there from one part of the Arctic to another?
- What are the major trends unfolding at this time?
- What are the main regional processes and global connections?
- Main changes since AHDR (2004) –10 years on?

Dr. David Hik, President of the International Arctic Science Committee, then discussed the legacy of the International Polar Year 2007-2008 (IPY). The IPY positioned the polar science communities to address important societal issues. Three unique characteristics

¹⁰ *Canada's Northern Strategy: Our North, Our Heritage, Our Future*, 2009.

¹¹ Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council, *Investment will strengthen economy and improve quality of life of Northerners*, February 25, 2011.

¹² *Arctic Human Development Report: Regional processes and global linkages Volume II (2010-2014)*

of the IPY were international partnerships, data sharing and preservation, and education and outreach. The IPY legacies included those associated with scientific infrastructure and collaboration, baseline data sets, and a better understanding of Earth systems. In addition, a next generation of researchers and leaders were created within the scientific community, but importantly, also involved Arctic residents. Continued research in the Arctic is well-positioned to lead new Earth Systems Sustainability programs being lead by the International Council for Science. This could help determine what institutional, economic and behavioral changes can enable steps toward global sustainability. A planned international polar decade initiative¹³ was described, and it was emphasized that there was no demand for new money, just an effort to better coordinate research and data analysis to better support risk management and policy making. This was an important theme; that the coordination of scientific research and analysis can address societal issues.

Mr. Kemal Siddique, Ambassador, Special Envoy for Arctic Affairs, Singapore,¹⁴ requested an intervention and emphasized that his country was very aware of the risks associated with changes happening in the Arctic as they affect Singapore, particularly with respect to sea-level rise. He stressed that Arctic change has global repercussions.

A representative of RAIPON¹⁵ discussed the interplay between government and societies and implications for Aboriginal communities. He stressed that co-management of natural resources functions well, but that partnerships in management would need some local autonomy. The question was asked as to whether or not Indigenous peoples' voices were too small compared to the international companies that bring work to the region. Gender issues were also stressed. How do women have an impact, and are they impacted by change? For instance, women were moving to the south. It is important to have gender issues in the conference statement. It was noted that this was true in Greenland as well, and that social sciences should focus on gender issues. Workers will actually have to be imported to do the work. However, the question must be asked as to whether it should be expected that the young men of the North should all want to become miners, etc. It was stated that resource extraction industries were not transparent, with information only being available in English for instance, not in Aboriginal languages. A Canadian delegate stressed that sustainability and natural resource development must be coordinated in development projects, noting that some terms of reference for projects include sustainability. Roads and hydro power may be legacies of development but this should go further. Governments as partners and collectors of royalties should push companies to manage for the benefit of the people. It was also noted that the second AHDR would be examining these very issues.

Mr. Morten Høglund, Chair of SCPAR, Norway, introduced the draft conference statement for CPAR approval. He stressed a number of the paragraphs including the need for a vision for Arctic ecosystem based science, traditional knowledge, and a move toward annual CPAR conferences. He also noted that it was the first time that the CPAR statement had included a request for applying gender-based analysis to decision

¹³ The ad hoc Steering Group chaired by David Hik and Jan-Gunnar Winther, *Draft concept of a potential long-term International cooperative initiative in the Polar Regions*, July 27, 2012.

¹⁴ Of note, Singapore has requested observer status at the Arctic Council.

¹⁵ Russian Association of the Indigenous Peoples of the North

making. The conference statement was adopted. Mr. Larry Miller invited parliamentarians to the eleventh CPAR to be held at a location in Canada. The CPAR was adjourned.

THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENTARIANS OF THE ARCTIC REGION

There were two meetings of the SCPAR associated with the tenth CPAR. The first was held before the CPAR in preparation for the Conference. The SCPAR also met with some observers who expressed their interest in the CPAR. At the second meeting, held after the conference, Mr. Morten Høglund was re-elected chair until autumn 2013, when he will not stand for re-election in the Norwegian elections. Ms. Guðfríður Lilja Grétarsdóttir, MP, Iceland was re-elected as vice-chair. Mr. Bjørn-Willy Robstad was also re-elected as secretary. A Canadian delegate requested that communications be opened directly with staff of the parliamentarians attending. The next meeting is to take place in Finland in November, with a spring meeting to be held in Washington, D.C., United States. A preliminary invitation was made from the chair for a meeting to be held in June in Svalbard.

Respectfully submitted,

The Honourable Percy E. Downe, Senator
Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association

APPENDIX I

Arctic Governance in an Evolving Arctic Region

Revised Draft, 22 August 2012

**A Proposal by the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region
(accepted by the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region,
September 5, 2012)**

ARCTIC GOVERNANCE IN AN EVOLVING ARCTIC REGION

A Proposal by the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region (SCPAR)

1. INTRODUCTION

The Arctic is changing. The peoples of the Arctic are facing great challenges because of these changes. For many years, the Arctic as the last wilderness was the main image portrayed. However, over the last decade, that image has taken on new dimensions. While the wilderness remains a prominent part of it, the peoples of the Arctic experience tangible realities such as climate change, melting ice, increased industrial activities and the possible development of the region's rich natural resources. This development has significantly diversified how the Arctic is viewed.

In addition, the Arctic Ocean is fast becoming an open sea. Cruise ships now enter Arctic waters. New commercial shipping routes are being actively tested. As the Arctic waters warm up, the current fishing stocks are changing their migration patterns, while southern fish populations are starting to venture northward. The fishing industry is moving further north than ever before.

The rich natural resources of the Arctic are becoming accessible. Mines are opening up; the potential for rare earth metals is being scrutinized and assessed. Oil and gas deposits are being explored and developed.

The melting of the sea ice and of the Greenland ice cap will have global impacts, and will influence the planetary climate system in several ways, among these being rising sea levels and the decreasing reflection of solar radiation. Climate change is influencing the livelihood of northern peoples in both positive and negative ways.

These changes, and the new development opportunities they have created, have turned the Arctic into an increasingly important region in political terms. All Arctic states meet these challenges by developing national Arctic strategies, while also the European Union is developing its Arctic policy, and non-Arctic countries are showing an increased interest in the region.

With an increased international focus on the Arctic the states and peoples are challenged on their governance structures. This in turn brings us to the Arctic Council, created in 1996 by the eight Arctic states as a high-level inter-governmental forum, established to ensure coordination and interaction among them, with the direct involvement of Arctic Indigenous Peoples.

The Arctic Council became the logical outcome of the discussions that took place among the Arctic states in 1989. At the first ministerial meeting in Rovaniemi, Finland, in 1991, the Arctic Environmental Protection Strategy (AEPS) was adopted. In the same year, Canada made a proposal for broad Arctic cooperation, which eventually led to the establishment of the Arctic Council in 1996, and the integration of the AEPS into the scope of the Council.

Today, the Arctic Council is the main political forum for cooperation on Arctic issues, and can be viewed as a success in new governance. The cooperation among

governments, the indigenous peoples and the scientific community has broken new ground in both structure and results.

However, the Arctic Council must now adapt itself to the new reality of the rapidly increasing political and economic importance of the Arctic Region.

This said, the future governance of the Arctic must continue to rely and build upon the strength of its existing institutions.

The eight Arctic countries should remain the core members and leaders of Arctic cooperation. The Indigenous Peoples of the Arctic must retain their special status and role as Permanent Participants within the framework of that cooperative undertaking. Their participation at all levels must be secured as a vital part of Arctic cooperation. Moreover, the participation of Observers must be welcomed as an important element of that cooperation.

Finally, the development of the Arctic poses a great opportunity to the peoples of the Arctic and the rest of the international community, to continue the development of a whole region of the World in a peaceful manner and low tension. The Arctic Council and its unique structure is an important framework for the continuation of this development.

In taking stock of the experience and lessons of the Arctic Council over the last fifteen years, and viewing the major challenges which lie ahead, the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region (SCPAR) feels it is timely to seek answers to the following central and specific question: **How can the Arctic Council best respond to the rapidly-changing evolution of the Arctic Region and its peoples?**

In seeking answers to this question, the Standing Committee has consulted a number of leading experts on the Arctic. We would especially like to thank Professor Niels Einarsson, Dr Lassi Heininen, Dr David Hik, Professor Timo Koivurova, and Professor Oran Young for their important contributions to this initiative. The Standing Committee will also consult the Indigenous Peoples' Organizations affiliated as Permanent Participants to the Arctic Council before concluding this document.

The original draft initiative for consideration by the SCPAR was prepared by Clifford Lincoln with assistance from Dr David Hik and Karen Kraft Sloan. SCPAR greatly appreciates the initiative and the cooperation with this group during the process of preparing this paper on Arctic governance.

2. SCPAR and PROPOSAL OVERVIEW

The Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region (SCPAR) was founded in 1994 as an initiative of the Nordic Council, to promote cooperation and interaction among parliamentarians of the Arctic states and the European Parliament, Indigenous Peoples' representatives and inter-parliamentary regional bodies (the Nordic Council and the West Nordic Council).

The idea behind the creation of SCPAR was that it should be a non-partisan body, joining parliamentarians of diverse political views and allegiances, whose common goal would be the well-being of the Arctic and its peoples. The cooperation with the Indigenous Peoples, especially Saami Parliamentary Council and RAIPON, is important.

Because of its non-partisan nature, SCPAR has been able over the years to become an objective and credible voice within the Arctic region. SCPAR has neither the funds nor the means to implement projects or carry out field activities. However, through the significant collective support of its parliamentary base, it acts as an important catalyst to promote ideas and proposals for the sustainability of the Arctic region.

From its inception, SCPAR became a key supporter of the proposal to establish the Arctic Council. Likewise, it played an important role in promoting the creation of the University of the Arctic. The Arctic Human Development Report was one of its initiatives, adopted in 2002 by the Arctic Council at the start of the Icelandic chairmanship. Through its Conferences, the SCPAR also provided an important forum for the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment (ACIA), led by Dr Robert Corell.

SCPAR does not intend this document to be either an in-depth research paper on Arctic issues, or a searching analysis of the Arctic Council and its subsidiary bodies. Nor is our objective to intervene or immerse ourselves in any way in the valuable work achieved and being achieved on so many fronts by various parties on Arctic governance issues, but rather to complement this body of work in a strictly defined and pragmatic approach.

This is why we are intent on keeping to a narrow and precise focus, namely that of specific aspects of Arctic Council governance. SCPAR has believed from the start that the Arctic Council should be the paramount structural body for ensuring decisive and effective coordinated leadership on Arctic issues.

At SCPAR parliamentary conferences, governance issues have frequently come to the fore. In 2006, governance was one of the main items on the agenda. In 2008 the Conference asked for annual ministerial meetings of the Arctic Council, and for a strengthened legal and economic base for the Arctic Council. The need for such a strengthened base was reiterated at the 2010 Conference, in addition to the call for an active dialogue with non-Arctic states, and the suggestion of an “Arctic Summit”. SCPAR has also long stressed the importance of an adequate and stable budget for the Arctic Council, funded by its member states.

At its 2010 Conference, SCPAR recommended the establishment of a panel to create a vision of the Arctic in 2030.

SCPAR fully recognizes the importance of the United Nations Convention Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) in the governance of the Seas such as the Arctic Ocean. UNCLOS provides the legal framework for clarifying issues related to jurisdiction and management in the Arctic sea areas. This was also confirmed in the Ilulissat Declaration between the 5 coastal states in 2008.

The Arctic Council is there to make a difference in the Arctic. SCPAR believes that for the Arctic Council to achieve its leadership role in the most effective way, its governance structure must be amended and enhanced in a few precise areas, hence the proposal outlined below.

3. PROPOSAL: A MORE EFFECTIVE ARCTIC COUNCIL

We are conscious that some of the ideas addressed here have been advanced by other parties and other reports. However, we propose to focus on a few central elements,

which we consider crucial to ensure a more decisive and effective leadership role for the Arctic Council.

The Arctic Council is now a high-level forum established to promote cooperation and coordination among the eight Arctic states, with the involvement of six Permanent Participants representing Arctic Indigenous peoples.

It also provides Observer status to non-Arctic states, to inter-governmental and inter-parliamentary organizations, as well as non-governmental organizations.

It coordinates and monitors the work of six working groups, themselves supported by scientific and technical expert groups. These working groups are:

- Arctic Contaminants Action Program (ACAP)
- Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP)
- Conservation of Arctic Fauna and Flora (CAFF)
- Emergency Prevention, Preparedness and Response (EPPR)
- Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment (PAME)
- Sustainable Development Working Group (SDWG)

The Chairmanship of the Arctic Council revolves every two years among the eight Arctic states, with ministerial meetings held at the end of its chairmanship by the country concerned. Traditionally the Arctic Council Secretariat has moved every two years, to the country holding the chairmanship. However, under the Norwegian, Danish and Swedish mandates, the three chair countries agreed to co-host a common Secretariat in Tromsø, Norway, from 2007 to 2013.

At its May 2011 Ministerial Meeting in Nuuk, Greenland, the Arctic Council decided to make Tromsø, Norway, the permanent site of the Secretariat.

The first binding legal agreement between the Arctic states was signed at the Nuuk Ministerial Meeting. Not only is the Search and Rescue Agreement important in itself, it is also a first step to giving the Arctic Council decision-making authority. The task forces set up by the Council to negotiate agreement on Arctic marine oil pollution, preparedness and response, and the Task Force on Short-Lived Climate Forcers have been welcomed by the Arctic parliamentary cooperation. SCPAR will play a constructive role in exploring beneficial new ways of taking advantage of this decision-making instrument.

These are SCPAR's recommendations:

(i) AN ESTABLISHED INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

To be truly effective and autonomous, the Arctic Council needs to be more than a coordinating instrument acting by consensus of its members.

It should become a fully fledged international organization, with an autonomous treaty mandate sanctioned by its members, with a permanent secretariat and an adequate and stable budget. The permanent participants of the Arctic Council must be included in the negotiating and decision making process in line with the traditions of the Arctic Council to have the voice of the indigenous peoples heard.

In advancing this recommendation, we need to move with caution. The process should be conducted in parallel with the normal work of the Council, and with preparatory meetings held, for example, in the margins of Arctic Council meetings. It can take years to negotiate a treaty and it is important to ensure that such a protracted process does not have a delaying and adverse effect on the actions and activities of the Arctic Council. Once this process has been concluded and the member states are ready to turn the Council into a fully fledged international organization, an interim period could be envisaged to enable the remaining structures from the old organization to be merged into the new one.

The members of SCPAR discussed this issue at length, examining and weighing up both sides of the question, i.e., whether to maximize the potential of the Arctic Council through its present structure, or to move toward a strengthened inter-governmental organization by means of a treaty sanctioned by its member states.

Certain members of SCPAR felt the need to clarify the following point, in order to avoid any misunderstanding or confusion. What is proposed here is not an international treaty on the Arctic, but strictly an exclusive treaty among the eight Arctic states to give themselves more formal inter-governmental binding powers.

In conclusion of the discussion, SCPAR decided to reiterate its recommendation that the Arctic Council become in the future a fully fledged international organization through a treaty sanctioned by its member states.

(ii) A PERMANENT SECRETARIAT

SCPAR has consistently recommended that the Secretariat become a permanent one, in a fixed location.

SCPAR congratulates the Arctic Council on having decided at its Nuuk Ministerial Meeting in May, 2011, to establish a standing Arctic Council Secretariat to be based in Tromsø, Norway.

SCPAR strongly recommends that the personnel of the Secretariat should reflect the membership of the Arctic Council, by including representatives of member states and of indigenous peoples.

(iii) AN ADEQUATE AND STABLE OPERATIONAL BUDGET

SCPAR has consistently advocated that the Arctic Council should endorse the creation of an adequate and stable budget to support the activities of the Council, and thus eliminate the vagaries and unpredictability of the current system of piecemeal funding.

SCPAR reiterates this recommendation, which it deems of essential importance.

(iv) AN ARCTIC VISION AND A TEN-YEAR STRATEGIC PLAN

At the present time, the incoming chairmanship selects its strategic plan and priorities for the next two years. We appreciate that the working groups ensure the ongoing scientific and technical work of the Council, and thus its operational continuity. However, at the critical political and decision-making level the focus and goals may, and do, vary from one chairmanship to the next.

We believe that at the political and policy levels, continuity in strategic planning is essential.

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

In order to achieve this vision, SCPAR recommends a strategic plan be adopted by the Arctic Council to cover a term of five chairmanships, namely ten years. This would be updated on a rolling basis to ensure an overall and ongoing coordinated vision, in a region where its need is becoming increasingly important, indeed urgent.

Within the ten-year strategic plan, priorities can be established, from which chair countries can select for follow-up and implementation as they access their mandates.

SCPAR finds the decision from the Arctic Council Deputy Minister Meeting in Stockholm 15 May 2012 very encouraging. The Deputy Ministers mandated the Senior Arctic Officials to start negotiating a statement to be adopted at the next Ministerial Meeting in May 2013. The statement shall be strategic and visionary about the future Arctic and the Arctic Council. This is very much in line with the proposals put forward by the Arctic parliamentary cooperation at the Conference in 2010 and also promoted in this paper. The Arctic parliamentarians will continue to seek influence on content of the Kiruna statement up to the Ministerial Meeting in 2013.

SCPAR further believes it would be beneficial to hold an Arctic Summit involving the heads of state or government of the Arctic Council member states, as well as the heads of the permanent participants. This idea was endorsed by the Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, held in 2010.

SCPAR is not committed to one option or another, provided that whatever process is adopted, the idea of long-term strategic planning becomes firmly established within the Arctic Council – instead of programs and projects which too often depend on the particular priorities and strategies of the incoming two-year chairmanship.

While discussing this issue, SCPAR members felt it important to reiterate their consistent call for annual Ministerial meetings of the Arctic Council at a Ministers of Foreign Affairs' level. In addition SCPAR recommends regular meetings of other key relevant ministries such as the Environment; Education and Research; and Health and Social Affairs.

(v) NEW AREAS FOR LEGALLY BINDING INSTRUMENTS

The Nuuk Ministerial Meeting marked the beginning of a new era for the Arctic cooperation when the countries signed the agreement on Search and Rescue. This way of cooperation is likely to continue and is supported by the Arctic parliamentary cooperation. However, one should have in mind that this way of cooperating traditionally only involves states, and that the cooperation structure in the Arctic Council will not necessarily be used in process. It is therefore important to have in mind that the role of

the Permanent Participants, the Working Groups and the observers will be different in this kind of cooperation.

SCPAR is of the opinion that several fields of cooperation could be suitable for legally binding agreements between the Arctic states, but would especially like to highlight two areas:

Arctic research and education

The International Polar Year has given Arctic research an important boost. It is essential to manage the heritage of the IPY wisely. We must use the momentum to further develop the cooperation and continue to enhance our understanding of the Arctic. Through a coherent approach to education, research, innovation and policy making, we will create sustainable societies in the North.

In order to learn the lessons of the International Polar Year 2007/2008 and prepare for a polar decade, cooperation among the countries within such fields as the financing of common projects and sharing of data needs to improve.

This is why SCPAR recommends exploring the possibilities for an Arctic research and education agreement. Such an agreement could facilitate circumpolar projects, with the opportunity for non-Arctic countries to participate, and smooth student exchange. SCPAR proposes to negotiate an agreement among the Arctic countries and other interested nations with the objective of securing access to data and sharing information about Arctic research.

Tourism

The Arctic is a beautiful place with a fragile environment. Arctic tourism is developing and has a huge potential for forging strong local communities. Building on the existing legislation such as the search and rescue agreement as well as the possible agreement on oil spill prevention and response, the Arctic countries should consider negotiating an agreement on how to develop and secure sustainable and eco-friendly tourism.

(vi) PERMANENT PARTICIPANTS

The participation of the indigenous peoples is one of the main reasons behind the success of the Arctic Council. As Permanent Participants to the Arctic Council, they offer valuable contributions as the principal trustees and protectors of their Arctic heritage.

Traditional knowledge has been an important element in preparing the assessments put forward for consideration to the Arctic Council. Furthermore, the indigenous peoples have served as an essential link in communicating the evolution of the Arctic to the rest of the world.

Funding for the participation of Permanent Participants to the meetings, as well as for preparation to them, is limited today. Traditional knowledge and modern science must collaborate as never before to find new ways of understanding the vast changes so rapidly happening to the Arctic, and their consequences. As the role and significance of the Arctic changes within the global perspective, it is essential that the participation of indigenous peoples must not only be ensured, but secured.

The key role of the Permanent Participants must not be diminished or compromised by an influx of new observers within the Arctic Council. The participation of Permanent Participants must remain an integrated part in the Arctic Council structure and decision-making processes. The unique structure of the Arctic Council, with the inclusion of indigenous peoples' representatives through permanent participation at all levels of the council's work must be upheld by the states.

The University of the Arctic (UArctic) recently elected a Vice-President for Indigenous Issues, and through its mandate has developed a strong link with the indigenous peoples of the Arctic. At a meeting in Stockholm in March 2012 UArctic and the Permanent Participants signed a Memorandum of Understanding to further improve the cooperation. SCPAR recommends that the Arctic Council explore the possibility of using UArctic, through its members, to assist the Permanent Participants in their important role and mission.

As the activities and importance of the Arctic Council increase SCPAR is of the opinion that the Permanent Participants must have sufficient financial resources as well as the human capacity to mirror this development.

(vii) OBSERVERS

As a long-time observer to the Arctic Council, SCPAR has found its dialogue with the Arctic Council beneficial to both parties, to the Arctic and its peoples. Representing the people of the Arctic countries, SCPAR appreciates the special role the parliamentary cooperation has been given among the observers to the Arctic Council. This special role should be maintained for the future.

Today the Arctic is increasingly attracting the active and concerned interest of well-meaning countries and country blocs. The Arctic Council now gives observer status to non-Arctic states, inter-governmental and inter-parliamentary organizations, and non-governmental organizations.

What happens to the Arctic environment, with the continuing rise in temperatures and resultant climate change, has wide-ranging consequences for the global environment. SCPAR has always held the view that bona fide parties, accepted as observers, could bring significant scientific, financial and other contributions to the Arctic Council, as long as they commit themselves to respect the criteria set by the Council.

SCPAR, for example, finds it positive to count the European Parliament as one of its initial and actively contributing members. At their Conference in 2010, the Arctic Parliamentarians also took note of the European Union's efforts to develop an Arctic Policy, and encouraged 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.

In addressing the above, SCPAR is keenly conscious that the issue of observer status remains both challenging and polarizing. SCPAR notes that at the Nuuk Ministerial in May 2011, the Arctic Council adopted the recommendations of the SAO report that set out provisions on the role and criteria for pending applicants for observer status. SCPAR hopes that this will allow for finding common ground between the concerns of the Arctic States and the aspirations of non-Arctic states with a clear interest in the

region. With regard to Arctic governance, this will be a major challenge during the next few years, and an issue that needs to be resolved in a way that will also allow non-Arctic states to make a constructive contribution to the work of the Council.

Accommodating new observers is also likely to lead to new working practices for the Council, in which the role and position of member states, permanent participants and different types of observers is more clearly defined than today.

It is, however, essential to ensure that the role and participation of the Permanent Participants be in no way diminished by a disproportionate influx of observers.

The issue of observers led to an animated discussion among SCPAR members. Members understand and accept the political reality posed by the emerging interest in the Arctic by the world's major power blocs. It is, however, of paramount importance that the well-being, as well as the values and rights, of the peoples of the Arctic region remain the focal priority. The consensus was that the Arctic must not become a setting for activities through which major powers influence forms of development prejudicial to either the long term interests, rights and obligations of the peoples of the Arctic, or the sustainability of the region. Thus, the Council should continuously be aware of the number and role of observers in order to maintain transparency and a structure based on the needs of the peoples of the Arctic.

The conclusion reached by SCPAR was that observer status should be granted cautiously and judiciously, and should always take into account the paramount long-term integrity of the Arctic and its peoples.

APPENDIX 2

**10th Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region Akureyri 5-7 September
2012**

Final draft

CONFERENCE STATEMENT



Final Draft

CONFERENCE STATEMENT

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

In collaboration with the indigenous peoples of the Arctic;

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

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

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

Regarding Arctic Governance and the Arctic Council to

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

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

Regarding Economic Opportunities in the Arctic to

15. Recognize ecosystems and science as fundamental, principle considerations in Arctic resource management.
16. Ensure that gender based analyses are used in the development, implementation and assessment of all Arctic policies.
17. Ask the Arctic Council member states to intensify their cooperation in the International Maritime Organization in order to speed up the work on a mandatory Polar Code for shipping, and intensify their cooperation on hydrographic data collection.
18. Efficiently implement the agreement on search and rescue cooperation in the Arctic and, in this respect, also conduct joint search and rescue exercises in cooperation with those countries whose vessels cross Arctic routes.
19. Increase sub-regional cooperation and coordination in the development of new transport strategies, and give the Arctic a prominent role in the implementation of the Northern Dimension Partnership on Logistics and Transportation.
20. Establish an Arctic Chamber of Commerce or Economic Forum that includes, amongst others, local communities and indigenous peoples of the Arctic.
21. Support capacity building, particularly through education, in order that local

communities will benefit more from economic development.

22. Support cross-border and trans-border economic and human cooperation in the Arctic Region, and consider how to strengthen the possibilities for travelling east-west and how to develop infrastructure for data-communications and satellite surveillance of cruise ships and other vessels in the Arctic.
23. Stimulate environmental innovation in leading sectors and focus on producing examples of good practices.
24. Develop overall strategies for assessing environmental, social and cultural consequences when exploiting natural resources in the Arctic, to ensure that any such exploitation is based on principles of sustainability.
25. Include strategies for mitigative action and adaptation to climate change as well as environmental effects in all analyses of economic development in the North.
26. Support continued close cooperation between the research community and other Arctic stakeholders.
27. Identify particularly vulnerable Arctic areas that require special management to secure biodiversity.
28. Prevent oil spills and finalize the oil spill preparedness and response agreement between the Arctic states.
29. Develop renewable energy suitable for the Arctic region and develop leading technologies in terms of society and environment.
30. Initiate joint research on challenges related to oil drilling and transportation of oil and other hazardous goods in Arctic waters in order to improve capacity in the event of oil spills and other environmental accidents.

Regarding Enhancing Human Development in the Arctic to

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

improve the interplay and complementary relationship between traditional knowledge and conventional science.

38. Strengthen the indigenous peoples' educational institutions by building competence locally in the Arctic including their own holistic knowledge.
39. Disseminate the rich knowledge accumulated during the International Polar Year and follow up on the IPY 2012 theme "From Knowledge to Action."
40. Anchor knowledge accumulated from Arctic research in the Arctic and secure local capacity building in education, research, policy making and local governance.
41. Support and increase the use of indigenous and community-based monitoring of living resources.
42. Continue the focus on human health and well-being, with an emphasis on mental health, prevention and food safety among Arctic peoples.
43. Continue to strength cooperation between the University of the Arctic and the indigenous peoples' organizations.
44. Develop a more structured partnership with the University of the Arctic, the International Arctic Science Committee, International Arctic Social Sciences Association and other relevant organizations.
45. Support the second Arctic Human Development Report and the plans for an International Polar Decade initiative.

Ask the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region to

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

Furthermore the Conference

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

Travel Costs

ASSOCIATION	Canada-Europe Parliamentary Association
ACTIVITY	Tenth Conference of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region
DESTINATION	Akureyri, Iceland
DATES	September 5 to 7, 2012
DELEGATION	
SENATE	The Honourable Percy E. Downe The Honourable Nancy Ruth
HOUSE OF COMMONS	Mr. Larry Miller Mr. Dennis Bevington
STAFF	Mr. Tim Williams, Analyst
TRANSPORTATION	\$12, 570. 44
ACCOMMODATION	\$ 2, 073. 70
HOSPITALITY	\$ 0. 00
PER DIEMS	\$ 1, 938. 64
OFFICIAL GIFTS	\$ 0. 00
MISCELLANEOUS / REGISTRATION FEES	\$ 0. 00
TOTAL	\$16, 582. 78