



ACCESS
Arctic Climate Change
Economy and Society



Project no. 265863

ACCESS
Arctic Climate Change, Economy and Society

Instrument: Collaborative Project

Thematic Priority: Ocean.2010-1 "Quantification of climate change impacts on economic sectors in the Arctic"

D7.15 – Advisory Board meeting minutes

Due date of deliverable: **31/03/2014**

Actual submission date: **01/04/2014**

Start date of project: **March 1st, 2011**

Duration: **48 months**

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable: **UPMC**

| Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Seventh Framework Programme (2007-2013) | | |
|---|---|---|
| Dissemination Level | | |
| PU | Public | X |
| PP | Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services) | |
| RE | Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services) | |
| C O | Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services) | |



Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| Adele Airoldi | 3 |
| Inuuteq Holm Olsen | 3 |
| Oran Young | 4 |

Minutes of the Advisory Board members on the General Assembly of ACCESS at British Antarctic Survey, Cambridge, 3 - 7 March 2014

Adele Airoidi

The situation of the EU in connection with the Arctic Council (AC) is still difficult. Contacts with Canada to resolve the outstanding issues are still continued, and so does EU work on Arctic issues, but without particular intensity or visibility. Basically the EU policy regarding the Arctic is currently in 'low tide' and it is difficult to predict how it will develop to in the future.

In terms of the role of ACCESS, the recommendation is that it should concentrate on those areas where the EU has competence. Generally the relevant work-packages of ACCESS, esp. WP2 and 3 appear to be in good shape. An impact by ACCESS research is difficult to guarantee, e.g. one open question is how to really involve stakeholders into the process. However, a new parliament and a new Commission will take function later this year and become fully operational by the spring of next year. This may turn out to be a good timing for ACCESS, which with its final results will have a chance to influence the direction of the EU Arctic policy under the renewed institutions. Finally, an important legacy from ACCESS would consist in having opened the way, in Arctic EU research, to an integrated scientific, economic and social approach,

Oran Young (comment): According to the latest Canada declaration the EU will be accepted to the AC when the 'outstanding issues will be resolved'. The EU is the one who probably needs to act next.

Inuuteq Holm Olsen

He informs us that following the last Nuuk meeting on fisheries in the Arctic Ocean among the five Arctic coastal states that they had agreed to protect the central Arctic Ocean from unregulated fisheries and will continue to work towards establishment of interim measures to prevent any future commercial fisheries without the establishment of appropriate regulatory mechanisms.

The Greenland Parliament in its Fall Session adopted a new bill, The Large Scale Project Act. The bill deals with projects that in the construction phase costs minimum 5 billion DKK which will permit import of foreign workers that Greenland cannot supply itself. It does not deal with the production phase. The Parliament also decided to annul a ban on any mining containing uranium which caused a lot of debate and controversy politically and in public debates ACCESS presentations were very interesting, with now more results coming in as the project proceeds, esp. the WP4 presentations dealing with resource extraction were very relevant from a Greenland perspective. The cross-sectoral view emerging in ACCESS is very important, also from a local perspective, since things are connected and should be looked at

from a more holistic perspective. This should also reflect in dissemination, which also should forward the cross-sectoral view.

Question Jean Claude: How could it be possible to better interact with the local and indigenous peoples to foster the planned Arctic Ocean Observation system, how could the Indigenous Coordination Center (ICC) help in this process?

Answer Inuuteq: A key issue here is the funding; it has been raised in terms of human resources and of financial ones. It would be necessary to allow active participation.

Oran Young

He was impressed by the single ACCESS results presented. The big issue will be integration of these results in the last part of the project:

1. The MSP tool construction is a great achievement. With the subsequent addition of layers with ACCESS findings it should be enabled to grow as a common property. A question is how to construct it in a way that it can be available for a wider community. What is it useful for? Some examples from other MSPs used in the past are mostly dealing with some kind of zoning. This might also be a use coming up for the ACCESS MSP. It will be important to move the MSP into a direction that it can easily used as a tool by a user.
2. For the synthesis it is important to realize that a summary of findings is something different than a real synthesis, with an added insight. The question is what are these additional insights gained by ACCESS?
3. With respect to the indicators for sustainable development we should look for just a few indicators which capture the underlying structures best. A danger may be though, that a single indicator may be too dominant (GDP as indicator for development is such an example).
4. Policy relevance. Regarding stakeholder interaction two rationales should be guiding the process:
Are they helpful from the scientific point of view? Are they useful to get the message across? An important insight regarding policy relevance of ACCESS work should be kept in mind: knowledge is just one of the sources for decision making. It may be helpful to realize where science has actually made a difference in terms of decision making, there are studies who identify those processes (Ronald B. Mitchell et al, "Global Environmental Assessments," MIT Press, 2006).
5. Regarding the synthesis we should be aware that 'small is beautiful', concentrate on few really significant results. So, what could they be, what are the 'signature findings' with which we want ACCESS in the future to be identified with?