



Agenda Item 5

AMAP WG 28/5/1

Whitehorse: 16 – 18 September 2014

---

## **AACA – status and challenges**

**Prepared and presented by AACA INT co-chairs**

**29 August 2014**

### **Background**

The AACA project was discussed at the AMAP WG meeting September 2013 and at the AMAP HoDs meeting in February 2014. This report is a status of the project and an update since the AMAP WG meeting last autumn.

As the first formal progress report from AACA Integration Team (INT), this report covers all progress since the initial meeting of the teams in Washington DC, January 2014. However, the focus is on the most recent activities.

We also give a brief overview of planned work the next six months.

### **Action requested**

AMAP WG is invited to comment on the attached status report and:

- Comment/discussion on the progress since last year
- Give feedback on the nature and frequency of reporting from INT co-chairs to AMAP WG/HoDs. Current plans call for monthly reports (this report is based, mostly, on the June 2014 progress report)
- Provide for any input/guidance concerning direction/prioritization of issues
- The INT co-chairs request that AMAP identify and appoint a third INT co-chair to take primary responsibility for the Baffin Bay/Davis Straight regional team and report. This person should be familiar with the BBDS region.
- Consider resource allocation for the AACA teams. In particular, the possibility of hosting a 3-5 day writers workshop covering all AACA and SWIPA CLAs and LAs in the first half 2015.

## **AACA status report**

### **1. AACA activities at the integration team level**

The focus of the Integration Team has been on clarifying objectives, roles and responsibilities among the INT and regional teams; organizing and coordinating the regional teams; and negotiating a shared regional table of contents. Those activities have been coordinated through regular monthly telecons (2-hour duration) that include the co-leads of the INT and each regional team. In addition, one of the INT co-chairs seeks to attend each of the meetings and telecons of the regional teams. To facilitate this activity Glen Peters has taken primary responsibility for the Barents region; Mike Kuperberg has taken primary responsibility for the Bering/Chukchi/Beaufort region and responsibility for representation at the Baffin Bay/Davis Straight team meetings has been shared among Peters, Kuperberg and Jon L. Fuglestad, AMAP Secretariat. Similarly, the AMAP Secretariat has provided support and coordination efforts to the regional teams. Jon L. Fuglestad has been the key person in this context. Recently, Jan Rene Larsen (also AMAP Secretariat) has taken over this responsibility for the Baffin Bay/Davis Strait team in this context.

#### *Accomplishments*

A key accomplishment of the INT team was the organization and implementation of the first cross-AACA workshop – the Scenarios workshop held 19-20 May 2014 at IIASA headquarters outside of Vienna, Austria. The report from that workshop is currently under development and is expected to be completed in September 2014.

Based on the AACA Implementation Plan a six-month work plan for AACA was developed and approved by the INT Executive Body. An AACA brochure (including an AACA logo) was developed. A regional Arctic map, showing the geographic extent of each regional team is under development and should be completed by September 2014. An internal, web-based sharepoint to share AACA documents has been developed and invitations to all AACA regional teams were sent in early August 2014. Author Guidelines (for use by all AACA reports and authors) are developed in draft and are currently being finalized. A table of contents for the INT pan-Arctic report is in draft form and has been shared with the INT for comment, see document AMAP WG 28/5/2.

The next significant meeting of the larger INT is a planned all-regional meeting in Ottawa in conjunction with the Arctic Change 2014 conference.

#### *INT Challenges*

Not unexpectedly, coordinating four reports, across eight nations presents challenges. Trying to reach agreement on key issues (i.e., table of contents and scenarios/case studies) has been a challenge. This is due to the diversity of background, concerns and resources across the different regions. Recent progress has been encouraging and we expect to be able to identify significant resolution to these issues during meetings to be held in conjunction with the AMAP Working Group meeting in mid-September. It is clear that continuing communication among all of the co-chairs is critical to resolving these (and future) issues. However, it is clear that many of these processes could be speed up by a larger face-to-face meeting with all AACA and SWIPA CLAs and LAs. This would allow detailed interactions between AACA and SWIPA, and detailed discussion across and between chapters in the different regions.

As noted previously, the two INT co-chairs are hard pressed to cover the three regional teams and to develop the pan-Arctic report. A request has been made to AMAP that a third INT co-chair be identified to take primary responsibility for the Baffin Bay/Davis Straight regional team and report.

There is a concern for lack of resources to support the project. AACA consists of 4 reports, ~12 co-chairs, coordinating lead authors (~20/report), plus potentially hundreds of lead and contributing authors. Given the constraints, certain issues have to be prioritised and we are concerned that as the

project moves into the writing phase co-chairs and leads may be overwhelmed. We will do the best we can to prioritise key issues, but it is also important that the regional teams know that they have the necessary resources and deliver quality reports. This concern will almost certainly also apply to the pan-Arctic report as it gets initiated over the next few months.

## **2. AACA activities at the regional levels**

Each regional team is at a different phase of organization and initiation. Overall the regions have focused on identifying team members (co-chairs and chapter leads); agreeing on a standard regional table of contents, and beginning to identify critical sectors/case study targets for analysis and deciding how to develop/implement/conduct those analyses. From an INT perspective the challenges of agreeing on a standardized table of contents and resolving concerns for dealing with potential Arctic futures are key issues facing the group. Efforts are underway to resolve these concerns, regaining momentum following the summer holiday season.

### 2.1 Barents Region (co-chairs, alphabetical: Ivanov, Kroglund, Lundeberg, Tennberg)

The Barents team have held regular telecons during the last year and arranged in-person Author Meetings in Helsinki, Finland (8 April) and in Lund, Sweden (17-18 June). The emphasis of their activities has been on finalizing the table of contents; developing detailed outlines of chapter content; identifying chapter lead authors (most coordinating lead authors have been identified ); and identifying a process for including the local and regional perspectives.;

#### *Barents Challenges*

The Barents team is concerned about their ability to obtain downscaled projections of regional and local climate to inform their report. Both the process and the resources to accomplish this task are uncertain at this point. The broad range of disciplines across the report makes it a challenging task to identify leads for the writing process, which can also fund their own participation. The Barents team is in particular seeking to identify a key missing chapter author (terrestrial biology) and to balance their geographic representation. There is a need to clarify the methodology to be used in the impacts assessment part of the report, and in this context ensure some level of consistency across the regions. As chapters develop, an obvious challenge will be to ensure a red line across the report, from drivers, through consequences to adaptation actions.

### 2.2 Baffin Bay/Davis Straits Region (co-chairs, alphabetical: Fortier, Mosbech, Simon)

The Baffin Bay/Davis Straits team held their first face-to-face meeting in Nuuk, Greenland in early June. The meeting was attended by the three co-chairs and numerous potential authors. The meeting also included a day dedicated to meetings with local stakeholders from government, Inuit organizations, the oil and gas sector, fisheries, mining and others. The group just completed its August telecom and plans a face-to-face meeting for November. The AACA related stakeholder survey was circulated to numerous Greenland stakeholders.

#### *BB/DS Challenges*

During the Nuuk meeting, the Baffin Bay/Davis Straits group explored a revised table of contents. In addition, the issue of long-term socio-economic scenarios made most of the group very uncomfortable, though the use of "case studies" has been proposed as an acceptable alternative. This issue is shared, to some extent, by the BBC team (see below). Discussions are ongoing with the INT and other regional teams to find an acceptable mechanism to explore the adaptation information needs associated with potential Arctic futures. The BBDS group is awaiting resolution of these issues before releasing the formal (AMAP) call for authors.

### 2.3 Bering/Chukchi/Beaufort Region (co-chairs, alphabetical: Hinzman, Klepikov, Outridge, Stern)



The Bering/Chukchi/Beaufort team held regular telecons during June and is planning a regional writer's workshop to be held in September in Seattle (following the AMAP working group meeting). The BCB leadership has been in contact with indigenous groups to solicit their involvement and input. Stakeholder interviews are being conducted on-line and via telephone to identify issues and concerns for the region. The group has settled on the original Barents table of contents as their preference and are identifying lead authors based on that structure. Current efforts are focused on author identification and planning for the September Authors Workshop.

#### *BCB Challenges*

The issue of long-term socio-economic scenarios made most of the group very uncomfortable, though the use of "case studies" has been proposed as an acceptable alternative. This issue is shared by the BBDS team (see above). This group also proposes a discussion of adaption options and limitations to climate change based on current understanding as another mechanism to address this concern.