

Final Report



Meeting of the parties
to the 1973 Agreement
on the Conservation of
Polar Bears

17 - 19 March 2009, Tromsø, Norway

Published by

The Directorate for Nature Management,

N-7485 Trondheim, Norway

ISBN 978-82-7072-822-5 (printed)

ISBN 978-82-7072-823-3 (PDF)

August 2009



The report can be downloaded in pdf format from
www.polarbearmeeting.org.

Final Report

Meeting of the Parties to the 1973 Agreement on the Conservation of Polar Bears

17 – 19 March 2009

Tromsø, Norway

Table of contents

TABLE OF CONTENTS	2
INTRODUCTION	4
BACKGROUND FOR THE MEETING	4
FURTHER INFORMATION ON THE MEETING	4
1 OPENING OF THE MEETING	5
1.1 WELCOME ADDRESS BY THE MAYOR OF TROMSØ	5
1.2 ADDRESS TO THE MEETING BY THE NORWEGIAN MINISTER OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ..	5
2 ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS	6
2.1 ELECTION OF CHAIR(S)	6
2.2 ELECTION OF RAPORTEURS	6
2.3 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	6
2.4 GENERAL RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR THE MEETING	6
2.5 APPROVAL/ADMISSION OF OBSERVERS	7
2.6 ORGANIZATION OF WORK	7
3 CONSIDERATIONS OF REPORTS	8
3.1 COUNTRY REPORTS ON KEY EFFORTS RELATED TO THE CONSERVATION OF POLAR BEARS AND THEIR HABITATS, INCLUDING REVIEWS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT.	8
<i>Canada</i>	8
<i>USA</i>	9
<i>Russia</i>	10
<i>Greenland</i>	10
<i>Norway</i>	11
3.2 SCIENTIFIC REPORTS ON CONSERVATION STATUS AND RESEARCH EFFORTS	12
4 REVIEW OF IMPACTS RELATED TO POLAR BEAR CONSERVATION	12
4.1 ACTIVITIES IN POLAR AREAS	12
<i>Industrial development</i>	12
<i>Shipping</i>	13
<i>Tourism and traffic</i>	13
<i>Safety measures for people and communities</i>	13
4.2 OTHER IMPACTS	14
<i>Pollution and contaminants</i>	14
<i>Reduced sea ice and climate change</i>	14
5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON MEASURES FOR IMPROVED CONSIDERATION OF POLAR BEAR AND THEIR HABITAT	15
5.1 NEED FOR A CIRCUMPOLAR ACTION PLAN	15
5.2 REVIEWING OPTIONS TO PROVIDE SCIENTIFIC SUPPORT TO THE RANGE STATES	16
<i>Scientific advice</i>	16
<i>Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK)</i>	16
5.3 OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON INPUT AND DISCUSSIONS	16
<i>Monitoring</i>	16
<i>Habitat protection</i>	16
<i>Export and import of polar bear products</i>	16

	<i>Co-operation in management of shared polar bear populations</i>	17
6	ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES	17
6.1	ASSESSING AGREEMENT EFFECTIVENESS	17
6.2	DATE AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING OF THE PARTIES TO THE AGREEMENT	17
6.3	ADOPTION OF REPORT FROM THE MEETING.....	17
	<i>Outcome of Meeting document</i>	17
	<i>Meeting Report</i>	17
7	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	18
8	CLOSURE OF MEETING	18
	APPENDICES TO THE MEETING RAPPOR	19
	APPENDIX 1 – APPROVED OUTCOME DOCUMENT FROM THE MEETING	19
	APPENDIX 2 – APPROVED FINAL TIMED AGENDA FOR THE MEETING	24
	APPENDIX 3 – TEXT OF THE 1973 AGREEMENT ON THE CONSERVATION OF POLAR BEARS	28
	APPENDIX 4 – OVERVIEW AND STATUS FOR POLAR BEAR SUBPOPULATIONS WORLDWIDE	31
	APPENDIX 5 – LISTS OF PARTICIPANTS	33

Introduction

Background for the meeting

The Agreement on the Conservation of Polar Bears was concluded in Oslo, Norway, on 15 November 1973, and today has Canada, Greenland, Norway, Russia and the United States of America as parties.

At a polar bear range states meeting in Shepherdstown, West Virginia, USA, 26 – 28 June 2007, the range states, in accordance with the provisions of the Agreement, including Articles VIII and IX, agreed that meetings under the Agreement should be held on a biennial schedule or otherwise as agreed to by the Parties.

The range states also agreed in Shepherdstown that the first such meeting should be held in 2009, and in 2008 the parties welcomed the offer of Norway to host such a meeting.

A formal invitation to the meeting was sent to the other parties from the Norwegian Ministry of the environment on 17 November 2008.

Against this background, the five parties met in Tromsø, Norway, 17 – 19 March 2009, with an objective to provide an update on the conservation status for the polar bears, review implementation of the Agreement, identify useful polar bear conservation strategies and to discuss mechanisms for enhanced implementation of the Agreement.

Further information on the meeting

A home page was established for the meeting, and can be found at www.polarbearmeeting.org. The home page includes documentation related to the meeting, references to the 1973 and 1981 meetings of the parties, and the country and scientific reports presented at the meeting.

The meeting was organized by the Norwegian Directorate for nature management (DN) and the Norwegian Polar Institute (NP) in co-operation. Contact details are as follows:

	Directorate for nature management	Norwegian Polar Institute
Address	N-7485 Trondheim, Norway	N-9296 Tromsø, Norway
E-mail	Postmottak@dirnat.no	post@npolar.no
Telephone	+ 47 73 58 05 00	+ 47 77 75 05 00

Further information on the meeting can be found on this home page and/or by contacting the organizers of the meeting.

1 Opening of the meeting

Finn Katerås, on behalf of the Norwegian Directorate for Nature Management and the Norwegian Polar Institute as organizers of the conference, welcomed delegates to the conference, referring to the 2007 Shepherdstown meeting, at which the Range States had agreed to meetings under the Agreement on a biennial basis, the next of these being the current one in Tromsø 2009.

1.1 Welcome address by the Mayor of Tromsø

The Mayor of Tromsø, Arild Hausberg pointed out that Tromsø is the centre of the green north, and is also a hub for science, with more than 500 researchers occupied with polar research. In the past, the town was a centre for expeditions hunting polar bears. Today Tromsø remains the polar bear capital of Norway, but now in a scientific context.

1.2 Address to the meeting by the Norwegian Minister of the environment and international development

The Norwegian Minister of the Environment and International Development, Erik Solheim, pointed out that Tromsø is a centre for polar research in Norway, and that a new dimension is now added – a national centre for ice, climate and ecosystems (ICE). The Minister sees that the polar bear is not just another threatened species. It is a proud symbol of the Arctic, increasingly associated with the vulnerability of all Arctic life. Polar bears are top predators and good indicator of the health of the Arctic ecosystem. To save polar bears we must save its habitat - the ice-covered Arctic sea. This is important for the survival of all organisms that are dependent on the Arctic sea ice - including Man. To succeed in conserving this important ecosystem, we must stop global warming.

The Minister referred to his visit to Antarctica two weeks earlier with other environmental ministers. The arrangement included a stopover in Cape Town. The Cape Peninsula contains more species than the whole of Europe due to stability of the regional climate over the past two million years which has allowed species to become highly specialized. The same principle applies to the polar bear which will react to fluctuations of a just a couple of degrees of climate change.

The Minister expressed his thanks to those who formulated the Polar Bear Agreement in 1973, at a time when hunting was the main threat to polar bears. The Agreement has been a success in protecting the species; hunting is substantively reduced as a threat to the species. Today, the main threats are climate change and, to a lesser degree, long range transport of pollution.

The Minister noted that the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) has upgraded the status of polar bears to “vulnerable” on their Global “red-list” of Threatened Species. A population reduction of approximately 30 % is expected within three generations if the decrease in sea-ice continues as projected.

The Minister has noted that scientists are warning that the reduction of Arctic sea ice could soon reach a “tipping point” and enter a cycle of warming and melting from which it is not likely to recover. This could become a self-generating and self-amplifying process, with the absorption of energy by the ocean amplifying the process of sea ice melting. Rapid reductions in sea ice may also trigger other mechanisms, such as the release of methane from the Arctic tundra and seafloor. The Minister asked for a clear message to Copenhagen on the need to protect the eco-system as a whole, not just in the

north but all around the world, and reduce the speed of global warming predicted by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). A two-degree increase in global temperature has to be the maximum.

The Minister sees the need to strengthen the polar bear Agreement in order to reduce and manage the other stress factors on polar bears and their eco-systems, such as habitat destruction, pollution, disturbance and unsustainable harvesting.

The Minister noted that the three main threats may be summarized as (1) climate change, (2) local threats, and (3) long range transport of pollution. The Minister expressed that he hoped this conference can draw up an action plan and send a strong signal to Copenhagen. The polar bear must be protected.

2 Organizational matters

2.1 Election of chair(s)

Norway as organizers proposed Hege Andenæs as Chair and Bjørn Fossli Johansen as Vice Chair for the meeting. Norway also proposed that Fredrik Juell Theisen be elected as Vice Chair for the first day of the meeting in the absence of Bjørn Fossli Johansen.

The proposal was approved.

2.2 Election of rapporteurs

The Chair proposed the following as rapporteurs: Svein Tore Halvorsen, Arne Egil Tønset, Karin Westheim, Solveig Dysvik and Mary Jones.

The proposal was agreed, noting that delegations should assist rapporteurs as appropriate.

2.3 Adoption of the agenda

The parties adopted the proposed agenda, which is included as an appendix to this report.

2.4 General rules of procedure for the meeting

The following rules of procedure were adopted for the meeting:

- The meeting will build on the 1973 Agreement and where relevant on provisions made at the meetings of the parties in 1973 and in 1981.
- All conclusions and decisions will be made by the five parties. This will be done through consensus, with all parties contributing with good will and with concrete and constructive proposals.
- A Chair will be elected by the five parties, who will run the meeting to the benefit of all the Parties and in line with international practice.
- Rapporteurs will be elected at the start of the meeting.

- The official language of the meeting will be English, but translation into Russian will be provided during the meeting.
- The final agenda and program will be approved at the start of the meeting
- The parties may agree to have closed sessions with parties only and/or discuss certain items in separate Head of delegation meetings.
- Norway will as host country provide necessary practical and secretariat support to the meeting.
- Media and observers may be admitted to parts of the meeting: opening and closing of the meeting, national and scientific reports.

2.5 Approval/admission of observers

Following consultations with the other parties, Norway had sent an invitation to the meeting to a number of relevant organizations to participate as observers. Four organizations had registered for participation by the set deadline, and the following observers were admitted to the meeting:

- North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission (NAMMCO) – *Intergovernmental organization*
- Nunavut Tunngavik Inc. – *Indigenous Peoples*
- Polar Bears International – *Non-governmental organization*
- World Wildlife Fund (WWF) – *Non-governmental organization*

2.6 Organization of work

Norway had proposed a timed schedule for the meeting, and this was approved as a basis for organizing the work during the meeting. The schedule is shown in the timed final agenda that is included as appendix 2 to this report.

In terms of detailed reporting from each session, the parties were requested to make their reports shorter and more consistent than those for the Shepherdstown meeting in 2007.

It was also agreed to establish a separate drafting group, to create a shortened Meeting Summary, focusing on meeting outcomes. It was agreed that the group would be chaired by Dr Rosa Meehan from the US delegation, and all Parties nominated one representative to the group.

In line with the agreed rules of procedure for the meeting, it was concluded that agenda items 1, 2, 3 and 8 would be open to observers, while discussions on agenda items 4, 5, 6 and 7 would be open only to party representatives.

WWF was offered the opportunity to make a presentation after the end of the meeting, in particular on their work on a circumpolar action plan.

3 Considerations of reports

The presentations made for the reports under this agenda item are all available on the meeting home page (www.polarbearmeeting.org), with key points and a summary being provided in this report.

3.1 Country reports on key efforts related to the conservation of polar bears and their habitats, including reviews of implementation of the Agreement.

Country reports were given to provide parties and participants with a general overview on status and challenges on national conservation, management, and regulatory issues, including national research.

In line with the invitation letter and the approved agenda, all parties were invited to give a report according to the following items:

- Protection of polar bear habitat and ecosystems (*Article II*)
- Taking of polar bears (*Articles I, III 1, and IV*)
- Hunting methods (*Article IV*)
- Harvest management practices
 - Subsistence harvest by native residents
 - Sport harvest
- Other forms of taking
- Challenges faced in managing for sustainable harvest of shared populations
- Polar bear/human interaction
- Exportation and importation (*Articles III 2. and V*)
- Legislation and other control measures, including national, bilateral, regional, co-management and other consultations (*Articles VI and IX*)
- Research and information exchange (*Article VII*)
- Compliance by nationals of non-Parties (*Article VIII*)
- Consultations for further protection (*Article IX*)
- Involvement of aboriginal communities
- Role of polar bears in the northern economy and issues around interaction with “problem bears”
- Use of Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge in polar bear management
- Role of co-management agreements

Canada

Canada noted and summarized that wildlife management is a shared responsibility between federal, provincial, and territorial governments, and co-management boards, and that Canada has a global responsibility for approximately two-thirds of the world’s polar bears. An overview of Canadian polar bear management was provided, including: the Federal Species at Risk Act (SARA), the work of the Committee on the Status of Endangered Wildlife in Canada (COSEWIC), and the system of harvest management and quota setting. Preliminary and sustainable trends in polar bear harvest were discussed, as well as current research initiatives, the status of subpopulations and human-polar bear interactions. This was followed by a presentation of traditional knowledge, co-management and Arctic wildlife under aboriginal land claims in Canada, covering topics such as TK (traditional knowledge), TLU (traditional land use) and TEK (traditional ecological knowledge) in the context of the Inuvialuit Final Agreement (IFA). The Canadian presentation concluded with a report on co-management.

The key messages from the presentation were as follows:

- Canada takes its responsibilities and obligations for the management of polar bears seriously – approximately 2/3 of the world’s polar bears occur wholly or partly within Canada
- Polar bear management is shared a shared responsibility – Wildlife Management Boards are key players
- National and sub-national committees, such as the Polar Bear Administrative and Technical Committees coordinate and ensure complementary management and conservation actions the Polar Bear Administrative Committee ()the Polar Bear Technical Committee ()
- Canada has a robust harvest management system to ensure the sustainability of 13 sub-populations
- Extensive community level consultations are currently underway with regards to potential listing of polar bear as a species of special concern under the federal Species at Risk Act

Russia noted that information was provided in the Canadian presentation concerning use of traditional aboriginal knowledge for grizzly bears in Canada, and asked how Canada uses this experience in the case of polar bears. Canada clarified that in the case of the polar bear, traditional knowledge was also taken into account by COSEWIC in their recent assessment. Russia noted that the Canadian report shows a range of subpopulations: some are increasing and two are of special concern, but the polar bear is listed as a species of special concern, and asked if this refer to all the subpopulations in Canada or just the two of special concern?

Canada clarified that the COSEWIC assessment looks at the 13 subpopulations as a single unit. The decision concerning the species being at risk relates to the entire population of polar bears.

Russia commented that the Russian Red List exists at two levels: a federal list adopted by federal ministers and ministers of justice as a legal act, according to a principle that either a whole species is listed or an individual subpopulation. Hunting is banned and in the case of polar bears, the whole species is listed on the Red List. The ban on hunting relates to the whole species regardless of indigenous population, since the principle of species conservation is broken if hunting is allowed for parts of the population.

Canada responded that COSEWIC protocols draw on IUCN criteria concerning populations of special concern. COSEWIC assesses polar bears as a single unit, whilst acknowledging the existence of sub-populations

USA

A presentation was made by the USA concerning polar bear management in the United States. U.S. laws and agreements include the 1973 International Agreement on the Conservation of Polar Bears and the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA), as well as the Convention on international trade in endangered species (CITES), the Endangered Species Act, the Inuvialuit-Inupiat agreement and the U.S./Russia Bilateral Agreement.

In May 2008, polar bears were listed as threatened in the Endangered Species Act. As a consequence the U.S. has implemented a ban on import of polar bear trophies. Some indigenous inhabitants in Alaska are allowed to hunt polar bears, only for the purpose of traditional use.

U.S. partnerships relating to the issue of polar bears involve the State of Alaska, the Alaska Nanuuq Commission, North Slope Borough and the Marine Mammal Commission. Various exceptions to the MMPA were discussed, including matters relating to litigation, legislation and export.

The U.S.-Russia Bilateral Agreement, signed in October 2000, was summarized, as well as the Agreement between the Native People of Alaska and Chukotka regarding the conservation and use of the Alaska/ Chukotka polar bear population. Canada and the USA also have a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

The presentation then summarized polar bear conservation efforts on the part of the State of Alaska and the 1988 Inuvialuit-Inupiat Polar Bear Management Agreement for Southern Beaufort Sea polar bears, which has served as an effective management tool for 20 years.

This was followed by a presentation relating to the Alaska Nanuuq Commission and the UMKA-Nanuuq Project, a collection of local knowledge regarding polar bear habitat use in Chukotka, followed by a presentation concerning the protection of polar bear habitat and ecosystems, and details of the Polar Bear Harvest Monitoring Program. Finally, there was a summary of research and monitoring activity in Alaska, including the Southern Beaufort Sea and the Chukchi Sea.

Russia

The polar bear was listed on “Red list species” in 1978. There is an absolute ban on taking of polar bear. Hunting by indigenous people (Chuckcher) is allowed under the bilateral agreement with the U.S., but details for such hunting are under discussion. There is a positive cooperation with the U.S. on polar bear management. Climate change, environmental pollution, oil and gas development on the Russian Arctic shelf, and transport in the Northern sea route are the most serious potential threats to polar bears in Russia. Follow-up of illegal hunting is the responsibility of regional federal authorities.

Following a question from Norway, Russia informed the meeting that in the frame of the U.S.-Russian agreement, discussions were ongoing for opening up for traditional polar bear hunting in Chukotka.

Greenland

Polar bears are essential to livelihood for indigenous people in some parts of Greenland.

Hunting is not prohibited, but there is year-round protection for all cubs and females accompanied by cubs. Quotas for hunting were introduced in 2006. Only full-time hunters are allowed to go polar bear hunting. A license is required for hunting and there is a detailed reporting system for all hunters. There is a voluntary export ban of polar bear products.

Greenland is focusing on sustainable taking and sees the quota system as a success in the management of polar bears.

The Greenland report presented polar bear research, listing research institutions and current research activities, current monitoring practices and important next steps. A more detailed analysis of studies of polar bears in Greenland was presented, focusing especially on sea ice and the distribution of the polar bear population; polar bear abundance across the country as a whole; and traditional ecological knowledge, with reference to polar bear population distribution, harvesting and climate change. There was also a focus on the influence of pollution. Greenland finds it very important that co-management agreements should be developed between nations sharing polar bear populations. Greenland is there-

fore looking forward to continuing its efforts to develop a co-management agreement (MOU) with Canada/Nunavut.

Russia asked, referring to the strategy plan on polar bear hunting, if Greenland can differentiate the catch from year to year, as in the case of whaling?

Greenland clarified that it is not the same kind of system as for whaling. There is a fixed quota for the whole of Greenland.

Canada asked if the quotas are enforceable, and do they include defence kills?

Greenland clarified that quotas are allocated to each relevant municipality or area, and that they also allocate licences. In that respect the answer to the first question is yes. Greenland further clarified that they also have wildlife officers in most of the polar bear areas. To the second question Greenland clarified that they consider looking at this question, though then there is a need to look at a series of three years to see how much this amounts to. The numbers have been increasing over the past two to three years, so there is a need to see if this trend is continuing.

Russia asked how many hunters are involved, and if Greenland has an idea of gender structure in hunting, do hunters take the biggest or smaller animals, and what kinds of principles exist?

Greenland clarified that in Greenland it is totally forbidden to hunt females or females with cubs, or to hunt or disturb bears in their dens, so this is a gender-based matter, and that the number of full-time hunters is about 760, and that they can potentially obtain permission to take a bear under the quota restriction.

Norway

Norway presented a report on polar bear conservation and the implementation of the 1973 Polar Bear Agreement, with reference to population status estimated in 2004 and the policy and legal framework relating to Svalbard and the Barents Sea regions. The various levels of national management responsibility were explained, as well as Norway's part in global and regional conventions, and in regional cooperation. Norway presented an analysis of the habitat situation with reference to Svalbard and the Barents Sea region; the impact of climate change with reference to temperature projections; habitat protection of the Marginal Ice Zone (MIZ), which may imply the incorporation of stronger regulations concerning tourism.

Other issues included in the report were the number of bears killed prior to 1973, and subsequently daily management procedures and other management issues and monitoring and research. Norway also highlighted key expectations for the meeting.

Canada asked if traditional knowledge is incorporated into decision making.

Norway clarified that in terms of polar bears, this is not relevant to Norway, as there are no indigenous peoples living in the Norwegian part of the polar bear environment. However, Norway follows closely how other countries use TEK, and noted that it will be of relevance in other areas of nature management.

Russia asked when it comes to territories other than Svalbard and the Barents Region, if Norway has thought about doing something about the situation also in these areas.

Norway clarified that these would be areas beyond Norwegian national legislation. Norway noted that there might be a need to look at the relevant obligations on the polar bear agreement, in order to pursue this further on an international basis.

Russia asked if the polar bear population in Svalbard is one and the same as that on Novaya Zemlya and Franz Josef Land, or are they different?

Norway referred to PBSG who states that these are two different polar bear populations (though not genetically different). The Barents Sea population borders that of the Kara Sea and data from recent research indicating that the bears migrate as two separate population units.

3.2 Scientific reports on conservation status and research efforts

In order to provide updated and available scientific input to the meeting, the chair of the International Union for Conservation of Nature's (IUCN) Polar Bear Specialist Group (PBSG), Dr Andrew Derocher, had been invited to provide presentations on circumpolar conservation status and population monitoring programmes and on conservation challenges and knowledge gaps. In addition, Dr Sebastian Gerland of the Norwegian polar institute had been invited to make a presentation on status and trends for reduced sea ice extent in polar bear habitat.

In line with this, Dr Andrew Derocher, chair of the PBSG, presented two scientific reports (co-authored with Dr Ian Stirling) on circumpolar conservation status and population monitoring programmes and on conservation challenges and knowledge gaps.

Canada clarified for the record that COSEWIC's assessment includes impact of climate change. Although climate change was not dealt with in a quantitative manner, it was included qualitatively in the report. As highlighted in the COSEWIC assessment executive summary, "If climate change continues to warm as projected by Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPPC), all populations of polar bear will eventually be affected". Those interested in the full science assessment can access it on the COSEWIC home page at <http://www.cosewic.gc.ca>.

Canada further noted that while PBSG's views on research needs and current status were appreciated, it was disappointing that the presentation also included an evaluation of at least one country's policies and programs which are outside of a science group's normal mandate.

Sebastian Gerland, Norwegian Polar Institute, presented a report on reduced sea ice extent in polar bear habitat – status and trends.

4 Review of impacts related to polar bear conservation

Based on the country reports and the scientific reports and on statements prepared for the different issues, key impacts related to polar bear conservation were reviewed and considered.

Conclusions and recommendations were agreed and are reflected in the report below, and are also included in the enclosed meeting outcome document.

4.1 Activities in polar areas

Industrial development

Industrial development continues to expand northward into areas used by polar bears. Several areas of oil and gas interest are identified within these areas. The parties recognize the need to identify key habitats for polar bears and areas in need of protection to establish a basis for land and seascape planning in advance of development. The Parties also recognized the importance of having general operating procedures and mitigation measures in place for developed areas. Such measures are in use in the U.S. Beaufort Sea coast oilfields and could provide guidance for other parties.

Monitoring impacts of industrial development on polar bears was considered important as was contingency (emergency) planning. The parties agreed that strict environmental regulations and standards are needed to protect polar bears potentially affected by industrial development.

Shipping

The parties recognized the likelihood of dramatically increased shipping as longer ice free seasons increase access and open new trans-polar sea routes (Northern Sea Route; transiting the Bering Strait; and Northwest Passage). Potential effects of shipping on polar bears include pollution, noise, physical disturbance related to ice-breaking, and waste.

Shipping scenarios and associated impact assessments have been developed through the Arctic Council (Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment). This assessment should be considered by the parties in their work to develop specific mitigation measures, including routing of traffic and other maritime safety measures; to identify monitoring and research priorities; and, to establish contingency plans to minimize impacts from shipping on polar bears.

Tourism and traffic

The parties recognized the value of tourism for economic and education development goals. In some areas, there has been a dramatic increase in the number and range of cruise ships moving further north into areas used by polar bears as open water access has improved. Potential effects of increased tourism include pollution, disturbance and increased risk of defense kills.

Actions to address such impacts could include limiting access to sensitive habitats, competence requirements for guides, guidelines and rules for operating in polar bear areas and near polar bears, measures to reduce pollution risks, and post trip reports of wildlife sightings and other activities from tour operators. Polar bear viewing opportunities are expanding in many parts of the Arctic, and the parties recognized the value of Canada's management experience in Churchill.

Safety measures for people and communities

Bear-human interactions will increase due to expanding human populations, industrial development and tourism. In addition, a continued increase in the number of nutritionally stressed bears on land due to retreating sea ice will result in more bear-human interactions. The parties agree on the need to develop comprehensive strategies to manage such conflicts. Opportunities to share techniques and develop strategies have been identified above. Some existing strategies include active deterrence, reduction of attractants, and community education and outreach.

Expertise developed for management of other bear species should be consulted in the development of strategies specific to polar bears. The parties agreed to exchange experiences with management of bear-human interactions and welcomed the US offer to lead such an effort in collaboration with polar bear experts and managers from the other parties. Two specific opportunities identified to develop

bear-human interaction strategies are the upcoming workshops in November 2009 in Canada and planned in Alaska in 2010.

4.2 Other impacts

Pollution and contaminants

The parties expressed concern that long range transport of pollutants into the Arctic environment is shown to affect polar bears. The scope of these effects on polar bear populations are only partially understood, but their impacts on some populations may be significant. The parties also recognized that transport mechanisms may be altered and effects on polar bears amplified as a result of climate change. Comprehensive monitoring and research on the effects of contaminant loads in polar bears, and synergistic effects of contaminants and climate change is therefore important.

The parties recognized the urgent need for an effective global response that will address the challenges of contaminants. Ongoing efforts within appropriate fora negotiating strategies to address contaminants should be informed of the significance of contaminants to the conservation of polar bears.

Reduced sea ice and climate change

The parties agreed that impacts of climate change and the continued and increasing loss and fragmentation of sea ice - the key habitat for both polar bears and their main prey species - constitutes the most important threat to polar bear conservation.

The parties noted with deep concern the escalating rates and extent of changes in the Arctic induced by climate change to date and that future changes are projected to be even larger. The parties agreed that long term conservation of polar bears depends upon successful mitigation of climate change.

Management responses

The parties agreed that conservation of polar bears requires adaptive management in response to climate change. The primary adaptation strategy will be to manage and reduce the other stresses on polar bears and their ecosystems, such as habitat destruction, harvesting, pollution and anthropogenic disturbance. Furthermore, continued climate change amplifies such stressors and underscores the need for proactive and comprehensive management strategies.

Resilience of polar bear populations to climate change depends upon proactive approaches and should be explored further to encourage conservation planning that is relevant both today and in the future. The parties have differing capabilities and recognized the advantages of sharing best management practices that address the range of impacts associated with climate change.

The parties agreed that effective responses depend upon an understanding of likely regional climatic and ecological changes. Monitoring climate and environmental change – in particular loss of sea ice and denning habitat - and associated responses in polar bear populations and the ecosystems that they depend upon is vital to allow for adjustments in management strategies.

Longer term perspectives

The parties expressed concern that ultimately, opportunities for polar bear conservation are limited by the magnitude and rate of change in climate and sea ice conditions.

The parties were also concerned that their common obligations to protect the ecosystem of which polar bears are a part can only be met if global temperatures do not rise beyond levels where the sea ice retreats from extensive parts of the Arctic. A scientific presentation noted that if sea ice is reduced according to present projections, polar bears are likely to be extirpated from most of their range within this century.

On this background, the parties recognized the urgent need for an effective global response that will address the challenges of climate change. Further, the parties recommended that ongoing efforts within appropriate fora negotiating strategies to address climate change should be informed of the significance of climate change to the conservation of polar bears.

5 Conclusions and recommendations on measures for improved consideration of polar bear and their habitat

Based on the country reports and the scientific reports and on the review and consideration of key impacts related to polar bear conservation, conclusions and recommendations were made on measures for improved consideration of polar bear and their habitat. These are reflected in the report below and are also included in the enclosed meeting outcome document.

5.1 Need for a circumpolar action plan

The Chair referred to the Shepherdstown meeting, where the Range States recognized the need for a coordinated circumpolar action plan for the conservation of polar bear populations. In light of the growing concern over polar bear conservation in relation to climate change and a number of other emerging issues, such as oil- and gas activities, shipping and tourism, the parties agreed to initiate a process that would lead to a coordinated approach to conservation and management strategies between the parties.

A key aspect of this approach is the recognition that plans for action should be developed at a national level leading up to development of comprehensive circumpolar plans for action that address polar bear conservation.

The process to provide advice to the parties will involve the following steps.

1. Parties request of PBSG an outline or identification of topics that should be included in all national plans for action. Furthermore, PBSG should identify elements that could benefit from international cooperation. The parties recognized an interest in accomplishing this step in 2009.
2. Parties will review and discuss outline material provided by PBSG.
3. Parties will identify and initiate specific topics of general interest (such as bear-human interactions).
4. Parties will identify topics where additional information may be helpful and develop further requests to PBSG as needed.

The parties shared a general expectation that significant progress would be made by the next biennial meeting.

5.2 Reviewing options to provide scientific support to the Range States

Scientific advice

The parties recognized that Article VII of the Agreement calls for all parties to conduct national research programs, particularly relating to the conservation and management of polar bears, and that they shall coordinate such research and exchange information on research programs, results, and data on bears taken. Parties continue to be committed to carrying out research in support of polar bear conservation.

The parties also recognized that the technical support and scientific advice on polar bear conservation provided by the PBSG to the parties supports the 1973 Agreement and is a vital part of the decision making process that the competent authorities should utilize in making their management decisions concerning polar bear conservation.

The parties agreed to ask the PBSG to accept the role of scientific advisory group to the parties and welcomed the offer by the PBSG chair to bring this to the PBSG for their consideration.

Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK)

The parties also recognized that polar bears play an important role in the socio-economical and cultural well being of aboriginal peoples. TEK in concert with western science should be utilized in polar bear management decisions.

5.3 Other recommendations based on input and discussions

Monitoring

The parties welcomed ongoing efforts to monitor status and trends for polar bear populations, and agreed on the need to strengthen monitoring throughout the range of polar bears, and to coordinate and harmonize national monitoring efforts.

Habitat protection

The parties reinforced the importance of habitat protection as a means of implementing Article II of the Agreement on protection of ecosystems of which polar bears are a part. Parties also welcomed efforts already undertaken on habitat protection, including protected areas and land and seascape planning.

The parties also recognized that expansion of protected areas can potentially reduce the vulnerability of polar bear populations and the ecosystems of which bears are a part. It was also recognized that protected areas should be designed with consideration of long term shifts in sea ice conditions that will result from climate change and the overall integrity of habitats critical to polar bear survival.

Export and import of polar bear products

The parties noted that the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) is the key regulatory mechanism for export and import in polar bear products and that all parties have adequate statutory authority for CITES. The parties acknowledged the significant progress made by Greenland in its implementation of CITES.

Co-operation in management of shared polar bear populations

Several polar bear populations are shared between parties, and the parties recognized the mechanisms in place for cooperation on the management of these shared populations, and encouraged further development of such cooperation.

6 Administrative issues

6.1 Assessing Agreement effectiveness

The parties agreed that a process should be developed to assess the effectiveness of the agreement to achieve its core objectives, and agreed to come back to this at a later biennial meeting under the Agreement.

6.2 Date and venue of the next meeting of the Parties to the Agreement

In accordance with the provisions of the Agreement, including Articles VIII and IX, the parties reaffirmed that meetings under the Agreement should be held on a biennial schedule or otherwise as agreed to by the Parties.

The parties welcomed Canada's offer to host the next biennial meeting in 2011 and Russia's offer to host the biennial meeting in 2013, noting that these offers facilitate a multi-year approach to coordinated implementation of the Agreement.

Recognizing the urgency of the situation, the parties have agreed to carry out regular, ongoing work leading to the 2011 meeting. Such collaboration would be facilitated by the host of the next meeting informed by the host of the previous meeting.

There should be established working groups to support the preparations of the meetings. Canada welcomed Norway's offer to co-chair this process.

The parties agreed to continued collaboration on an interim basis as necessary between biennial meetings. Such collaboration would be facilitated by the host of the next meeting.

6.3 Adoption of report from the meeting

Outcome of Meeting document

An "Outcome of Meeting document" had been prepared by the drafting group established for this purpose and had been discussed by the heads of delegation, and the document was adopted in plenary with two minor adjustments. The approved document is enclosed as appendix 1 to this meeting report¹.

Meeting Report

¹ It should be noted that unofficial translations of the outcome document have been made into Russian and Norwegian, and these versions are available on the meeting home page at www.polarbearmeeting.org.

A draft report for the two first days was provided to the delegations during the meeting. It was agreed that the final meeting report would be finalized and approved by written procedure based on necessary consultations with the heads of delegation. Following approval, the report would be distributed to all delegations, made available on the meeting home page, and be submitted to the Norwegian Ministry of foreign affairs on behalf of Norway as depository government for the agreement.

7 Any other business

No further issues were presented for consideration.

8 Closure of meeting

The Chair thanked those concerned for their efforts in producing this document and for good working results, and closed the meeting.

The USA offered recognition of the hard work of all the delegates and the exceptional job done by the Chair. On behalf of the USA delegation and the meeting as a whole, Charles Johnson of the Alaska Nanuuq Commission presented the Chair, Hege Andenæs of the Norwegian Ministry of the Environment, with a knife suitable for skinning a polar bear.

The Chair thanked all the Parties and the meeting as a whole for a very good and effective meeting, and excellent results, including agreement on a number of important issues to bring forward the conservation of polar bears. These include agreement on a formal meeting structure to meet biennially, with Canada hosting the next meeting and Russia the one after that; that meetings should be arranged on a regular basis between the biennial meetings; that climate change should be addressed as a very important issue; and that action plans should be formulated at national and circumpolar levels, with working plans agreed for this. The Chair then thanked the meeting secretariat and the interpreters.

Canada echoed the USA's thanks: to the Chair for doing such a good job of chairing the meeting; to the Norwegian Government for hosting the meeting; to Finn Katerås; and for all the social and networking opportunities afforded at the meeting.

USA informed the meeting that the legal waiver contained in the footnote of the outcome document is a necessary requirement for them, but that they are committed to the content of the document.

The Chair concluded by looking forward to the next meeting in Canada and declared the meeting closed.

Appendices to the meeting rapport

Appendix 1 – Approved Outcome document from the meeting

Meeting of the parties to the 1973 Agreement on the Conservation of Polar Bears

Tromsø, Norway, 17 – 19 March 2009

OUTCOME OF MEETING ***

Climate change has a negative impact on polar bears and their habitat and is the most important long term threat facing polar bears. Action to mitigate this threat is beyond the scope of the Polar Bear Agreement. Climate change affects every nation on the earth and reaches well beyond the five parties to the Agreement so the parties look to other fora and national and international mechanisms to take appropriate action to address climate change.

Introduction

The Agreement on the Conservation of Polar Bears was concluded in Oslo, Norway, on 15 November 1973, and today has Canada, Greenland, Norway, Russia and the United States of America as parties.

At a polar bear range states meeting in Shepherdstown, West Virginia, USA, 26 – 28 June 2007, the range states, in accordance with the provisions of the Agreement, including Articles VIII and IX, agreed that meetings under the Agreement should be held on a biennial schedule or otherwise as agreed to by the Parties.

The range states also agreed in Shepherdstown that the first such meeting should be held in 2009, and in 2008 the parties welcomed the offer of Norway to host such a meeting.

Against this background, the five parties met in Tromsø, Norway, 17 – 19 March 2009, with an objective to provide an update on the conservation status for the polar bears, review implementation of the Agreement, identify useful polar bear conservation strategies and to discuss mechanisms for enhanced implementation of the Agreement.

Harvest Management

The parties continue to regard harvest management as an important part of polar bear management. The parties note the important progress made in developing sustainable harvest regimes, including the setting of bilateral coordinating mechanisms. The parties recognized the cultural and nutritional importance of subsistence harvest of polar bears to the Native peoples of the north.

Polar bears and climate change

The parties agreed that impact of climate change and the continued and increasing loss and fragmentation of sea ice -- the key habitat for both polar bears and their main prey species -- constitutes the most important threat to polar bear conservation.

The parties noted with deep concern the escalating rates and extent of changes in the Arctic induced by climate change to date and that future changes are projected to be even larger. The parties agreed that long term conservation of polar bears depends upon successful mitigation of climate change.

Management responses

The parties agreed that conservation of polar bears requires adaptive management in response to climate change. The primary adaptation strategy will be to manage and reduce the other stresses on polar bears and their ecosystems, such as habitat destruction, harvesting, pollution and anthropogenic disturbance. Furthermore, continued climate change amplifies such stressors and underscores the need for proactive and comprehensive management strategies.

Resilience of polar bear populations to climate change depends upon proactive approaches and should be explored further to encourage conservation planning that is relevant both today and in the future. The parties have differing capabilities and recognized the advantages of sharing best management practices that address the range of impacts associated with climate change.

The parties agreed that effective responses depend upon an understanding of likely regional climatic and ecological changes. Monitoring climate and environmental change – in particular loss of sea ice and denning habitat - and associated responses in polar bear populations and the ecosystems that they depend upon is vital to allow for adjustments in management strategies.

Longer term perspectives

The parties expressed concern that ultimately, opportunities for polar bear conservation are limited by the magnitude and rate of change in climate and sea ice conditions.

The parties were also concerned that their common obligations to protect the ecosystem of which polar bears are a part can only be met if global temperatures do not rise beyond levels where the sea ice retreats from extensive parts of the Arctic. A scientific presentation noted that if sea ice is reduced according to present projections, polar bears are likely to be extirpated from most of their range within this century.

On this background, the parties recognized the urgent need for an effective global response that will address the challenges of climate change. Further, the parties recommended that ongoing efforts within appropriate fora negotiating strategies to address climate change should be informed of the significance of climate change to the conservation of polar bears.

Habitat protection

The parties reinforced the importance of habitat protection as a means of implementing Article II of the Agreement on protection of ecosystems of which polar bears are a part. Parties also welcomed efforts already undertaken on habitat protection, including protected areas and land and seascape planning.

The parties also recognized that expansion of protected areas can potentially reduce the vulnerability of polar bear populations and the ecosystems of which bears are a part. It was also recognized that protected areas should be designed with consideration of long-term shifts in sea ice conditions that will result from climate change and the overall integrity of habitats critical to polar bear survival.

Contaminants and pollution

The parties expressed concern that long range transport of pollutants into the Arctic environment is shown to affect polar bears. The scope of these effects on polar bear populations are only partially understood, but their impacts on some populations may be significant. The parties also recognized that

transport mechanisms may be altered and effects on polar bears amplified as a result of climate change. Comprehensive monitoring and research on the effects of contaminant loads in polar bears, and synergistic effects of contaminants and climate change is therefore important.

The parties recognized the urgent need for an effective global response that will address the challenges of contaminants. Ongoing efforts within appropriate fora negotiating strategies to address contaminants should be informed of the significance of contaminants to the conservation of polar bears.

Activities in polar bear areas

Industrial development

Industrial development continues to expand northward into areas used by polar bears. Several areas of oil and gas interest are identified within these areas. The parties recognize the need to identify key habitats for polar bears and areas in need of protection to establish a basis for land and seascape planning in advance of development. The parties also recognized the importance of having general operating procedures and mitigation measures in place for developed areas. Such measures are in use in the US Beaufort Sea coast oilfields and could provide guidance for other parties. Monitoring impacts of industrial development on polar bears was considered important as was contingency (emergency) planning. The parties agreed that strict environmental regulations and standards are needed to protect polar bears potentially affected by industrial development.

Shipping

The parties recognized the likelihood of dramatically increased shipping as longer ice-free seasons increase access and open new trans-polar sea routes (Northern Sea Route; transiting the Bering Strait; and Northwest Passage). Potential effects of shipping on polar bears include pollution, noise, physical disturbance related to ice-breaking, and waste. Shipping scenarios and associated impact assessments have been developed through the Arctic Council (Arctic Marine Shipping Assessment). This assessment should be considered by the parties in their work to develop specific mitigation measures, including routing of traffic and other maritime safety measures; to identify monitoring and research priorities; and, to establish contingency plans to minimize impacts from shipping on polar bears.

Tourism and traffic

The parties recognized the value of tourism for economic and education development goals. In some areas, there has been a dramatic increase in the number and range of cruise ships moving further north into areas used by polar bears as open water access has improved. Potential effects of increased tourism include pollution, disturbance and increased risk of defense kills. Actions to address such impacts could include limiting access to sensitive habitats, competence requirements for guides, guidelines and rules for operating in polar bear areas and near polar bears, measures to reduce pollution risks, and post trip reports of wildlife sightings and other activities from tour operators. Polar bear viewing opportunities are expanding in many parts of the Arctic, and the parties recognized the value of Canada's management experience in Churchill.

Safety measures for people and communities

Bear-human interactions will increase due to expanding human populations, industrial development and tourism. In addition, a continued increase in the number of nutritionally stressed bears on land due to retreating sea ice will result in more bear-human interactions. The parties agree on the need to

develop comprehensive strategies to manage such conflicts. Opportunities to share techniques and develop strategies have been identified above. Some existing strategies include active deterrence, reduction of attractants, and community education and outreach. Expertise developed for management of other bear species should be consulted in the development of strategies specific to polar bears. The parties agreed to exchange experiences with management of bear-human interactions and welcomed the US offer to lead such an effort in collaboration with polar bear experts and managers from the other parties.

Two specific opportunities identified to develop bear-human interaction strategies are the upcoming workshops in November 2009 in Canada and planned in Alaska in 2010.

Development of plans for action

In light of the growing concern over polar bear conservation in relation to climate change and a number of other emerging issues, such as oil- and gas activities, shipping and tourism, the parties agreed to initiate a process that would lead to a coordinated approach to conservation and management strategies between the parties.

A key aspect of this approach is the recognition that plans for action should be developed at a national level leading up to development of comprehensive circumpolar plans for action that address polar bear conservation.

The process to provide advice to the parties will involve the following steps.

1. Parties request of PBSG an outline or identification of topics that should be included in all national plans for action. Furthermore, PBSG should identify elements that could benefit from international cooperation. The parties recognized an interest in accomplishing this step in 2009.
2. Parties will review and discuss outline material provided by PBSG.
3. Parties will identify and initiate specific topics of general interest (such as bear-human interactions).
4. Parties will identify topics where additional information may be helpful and develop further requests to PBSG as needed.

The parties shared a general expectation that significant progress would be made by the next biennial meeting.

Traditional Ecological Knowledge

The parties recognized that polar bears play an important role in the socio-economical and cultural well being of aboriginal peoples. TEK in concert with western science should be considered in polar bear management decisions.

Scientific advice

The parties recognized that Article VII of the Agreement calls for all parties to conduct national research programs, particularly relating to the conservation and management of polar bears, and that they shall coordinate such research and exchange information on research programs, results, and data on bears taken. Parties continue to be committed to carrying out research in support of polar bear conservation.

The parties also recognized that the technical support and scientific advice on polar bear conservation provided by the PBSG to the parties supports the 1973 Agreement and is a vital part of the decision

making process that the competent authorities should utilize in making their management decisions concerning polar bear conservation.

The parties agreed to ask the PBSG to accept the role of scientific advisory group to the parties and welcomed the offer by the PBSG chair to bring this to the PBSG for their consideration.

Other issues related to the conservation of polar bears

Export and import of polar bear products

The parties noted that the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) is the key regulatory mechanism for export and import in polar bear products and that all parties have adequate statutory authority for CITES. The parties acknowledged the significant progress made by Greenland in its implementation of CITES.

Cooperation in management of shared polar bear populations

Several polar bear populations are shared between parties, and the parties recognized the mechanisms in place for cooperation on the management of these shared populations, and encouraged further development of such cooperation.

Monitoring

The parties welcomed ongoing efforts to monitor status and trends for polar bear populations, and agreed on the need to strengthen monitoring throughout the range of polar bears, and to coordinate and harmonize national monitoring efforts.

Assessing the effectiveness of the Agreement

The parties agreed that a process should be developed to assess the effectiveness of the agreement to achieve its core objectives, and agreed to come back to this at a later biennial meeting under the Agreement.

Commitment to Continued Cooperation

In accordance with the provisions of the Agreement, including Articles VIII and IX, the parties reaffirmed that meetings under the Agreement should be held on a biennial schedule or otherwise as agreed to by the Parties.

The parties welcomed Canada's offer to host the next biennial meeting in 2011 and Russia's offer to host the biennial meeting in 2013, noting that these offers facilitate a multi-year approach to coordinated implementation of the Agreement.

Recognizing the urgency of the situation, the parties have agreed to carry out regular, ongoing work leading to the 2011 meeting. Such collaboration would be facilitated by the host of the next meeting informed by the host of the previous meeting.

**** This outcome document is not legally binding and creates no legally binding obligations of the parties to the 1973 multilateral agreement for the conservation of polar bears.*

Appendix 2 – Approved final timed agenda for the meeting

TIMED FINAL AGENDA

Monday 16 March

18.00 - 20.00 Reception hosted by the Norwegian Ministry of the Environment, Polaria

Tuesday 17 March

Meeting convenes at 09.00

09.00 - 11.00

1 OPENING OF THE CONFERENCE

- 1.1 Address to the meeting by the Mayor of Tromsø**
- 1.2 Opening of the meeting by the Norwegian Minister for Environment and International Development**

2 ORGANIZATIONAL MATTERS

- 2.1 Election of Chair(s)**
- 2.2 Election of Rapporteur(s)**
- 2.3 Adoption of the Agenda**
- 2.4 General rules of procedure for the meeting**
- 2.5 Approval/admission of observers**
- 2.6 Organization of work**

11.00 - 11.30 Coffee/tea break

11.30 – 13.00

3 CONSIDERATIONS OF REPORTS

- 3.1 Country reports on key efforts related to the conservation of polar bears and their habitats, including reviews of implementation of the Agreement.**

Each country report should include updates on the following:

- 3.1.1 Protection of polar bear habitat and ecosystems (*Article II*)
- 3.1.2 Taking of polar bears (*Articles I, III 1, and IV*)
 - Hunting methods (*Article IV*)
 - Harvest management practices

- Subsistence harvest by native residents

- Sport harvest

Other forms of taking

Challenges faced in managing for sustainable harvest of shared populations

Polar bear/human interaction

3.1.3 Exportation and importation (*Articles III 2. and V*)

3.1.4 Legislation and other control measures, including national, bilateral, regional, co-management and other consultations (*Articles VI and IX*)

3.1.5 Research and information exchange (*Article VII*)

3.1.6 Compliance by nationals of non-Parties (*Article VIII*)

3.1.7 Consultations for further protection (*Article IX*)

3.1.8 Involvement of aboriginal communities

Role of polar bears in the northern economy and issues around interaction with “problem bears”

Use of Aboriginal Traditional Knowledge in polar bear management

Role of co-management agreements

13.00 - 14.00 Lunch at hotel

14.00 - 15.30

3 CONSIDERATIONS OF REPORTS (*continued*)

15.30 - 16.00 Coffee/tea break

16.00 - 17.30

3.2 Scientific reports on conservation status and research efforts - invited speakers

Circumpolar conservation status and population monitoring programmes (*Andrew Derocher, PBSG*)

Conservation challenges and knowledge gaps (*Andrew Derocher, PBSG*)

On reduced sea ice extent in polar bear habitat – status and trends (*Sebastian Gerland, Norwegian Polar Institute*)

19.00 - 20.00 Reception hosted by the City of Tromsø, City Hall

Wednesday 18 March

Meeting convenes 09.00

09.00 – 13.00 (including coffee/tea break 10.30 - 11.00)

4 REVIEW OF IMPACTS RELATED TO POLAR BEAR CONSERVATION (CLOSED SESSION)

4.1 Activities in polar areas

Industrial developments, including oil and gas activities

Infrastructure developments

Transportation, including shipping

Tourism and traffic

Safety measures for people and communities

4.2 Other impacts

Pollution and contaminants

Reduced sea ice and climate change

13.00 - 14.00 Lunch at hotel

14.00 – 17.30 (including coffee/tea break 15.30 - 16.00)

5 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON MEASURES FOR IMPROVED CONSIDERATION OF POLAR BEAR AND THEIR HABITAT (CLOSED SESSION)

5.1 Need for a circumpolar action plan

5.2 Reviewing options to provide scientific support to the Range States

5.3 Other recommendations based on input and discussions in agenda items 3 and 4

6 ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES (CLOSED SESSION)

6.1 Assessing Agreement effectiveness

18.00 - 22.30 Tour to Sommarøy hosted by the Directorate for Nature Management and the Norwegian Polar Institute

Thursday 19 March

Meeting convenes 09.00

09.00 – 13.00 (*including coffee/tea break 10.30 - 11.00*)

6 ADMINISTRATIVE ISSUES (*continued*)

6.2 Date and venue of the next meeting of the Parties to the Agreement

6.3 Adoption of report from the meeting

7 Any other business

8 Closure of meeting

13.00 - 14.00 Lunch at hotel

Appendix 3 – Text of the 1973 Agreement on the Conservation of Polar Bears

Agreement on the Conservation of Polar Bears

Oslo, 15 November 1973

The Governments of Canada, Denmark, Norway, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America,

Recognizing the special responsibilities and special interests of the States of the Arctic Region in relation to the protection of the fauna and flora of the Arctic Region;

Recognizing that the polar bear is a significant resource of the Arctic Region which requires additional protection;

Having decided that such protection should be achieved through co-ordinated national measures taken by the States of the Arctic Region;

Desiring to take immediate action to bring further conservation and management measures into effect;

Having agreed as follows:

Article I

1. The taking of polar bears shall be prohibited except as provided in Article III.
2. For the purposes of this Agreement, the term "taking" includes hunting, killing and capturing.

Article II

Each Contracting Party shall take appropriate action to protect the ecosystems of which polar bears are a part, with special attention to habitat components such as denning and feeding sites and migration patterns, and shall manage polar bear populations in accordance with sound conservation practices based on the best available scientific data.

Article III

1. Subject to the provisions of Articles II and IV any Contracting Party may allow the taking of polar bears when such taking is carried out:
 - a) for bona fide scientific purposes; or
 - b) by that Party for conservation purposes; or
 - c) to prevent serious disturbance of the management of other living resources, subject to forfeiture to that Party of the skins and other items of value resulting from such taking; or
 - d) by local people using traditional methods in the exercise of their traditional rights and in accordance with the laws of that Party; or
 - e) wherever polar bears have or might have been subject to taking by traditional means by its nationals.

2. The skins and other items of value resulting from taking under sub-paragraph (b) and (c) of paragraph 1 of this Article shall not be available for commercial purposes.

Article IV

The use of aircraft and large motorized vessels for the purpose of taking polar bears shall be prohibited, except where the application of such prohibition would be inconsistent with domestic laws.

Article V

A Contracting Party shall prohibit the exportation from, the importation and delivery into, and traffic within, its territory of polar bears or any part or product thereof taken in violation of this Agreement.

Article VI

1. Each Contracting Party shall enact and enforce such legislation and other measures as may be necessary for the purpose of giving effect to this Agreement.
2. Nothing in this Agreement shall prevent a Contracting Party from maintaining or amending existing legislation or other measures or establishing new measures on the taking of polar bears so as to provide more stringent controls than those required under the provisions of this Agreement.

Article VII

The Contracting Parties shall conduct national research programmes on polar bears, particularly research relating to the conservation and management of the species. They shall as appropriate co-ordinate such research with research carried out by other Parties, consult with other Parties on the management of migrating polar bear populations, and exchange information on research and management programmes, research results and data on bears taken.

Article VIII

Each Contracting Party shall take action as appropriate to promote compliance with the provisions of this Agreement by nationals of States not party to this Agreement.

Article IX

The Contracting Parties shall continue to consult with one another with the object of giving further protection to polar bears.

Article X

1. This Agreement shall be open for signature at Oslo by the Governments of Canada, Denmark, Norway, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the United States of America until 31st March 1974.
2. This Agreement shall be subject to ratification or approval by the signatory Governments. Instruments of ratification or approval shall be deposited with the Government of Norway as soon as possible.
3. This Agreement shall be open for accession by the Governments referred to in paragraph I of this Article. Instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Depositary Government.

4. This Agreement shall enter into force ninety days after the deposit of the third instrument of ratification, approval or accession. Thereafter, it shall enter into force for a signatory or acceding Government on the date of deposit of its instrument of ratification, approval or accession.

5. This Agreement shall remain in force initially for a period of five years from its date of entry into force, and unless any Contracting Party during that period requests the termination of the Agreement at the end of that period, it shall continue in force thereafter.

6. On the request addressed to the Depositary Government by any of the Governments referred to in paragraph I of this Article, consultations shall be conducted with a view to convening a meeting of representatives of the five Governments to consider the revision or amendment of this Agreement.

7. Any Party may denounce this Agreement by written notification to the Depositary Government at any time after five years from the date of entry into force of this Agreement. The denunciation shall take effect twelve months after the Depositary Government has received the notification.

8. The Depositary Government shall notify the Governments referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article of the deposit of instruments of ratification, approval or accession, of the entry into force of this Agreement and of the receipt of notifications of denunciation and any other communications from a Contracting Part specifically provided for in this Agreement.

9. The original of this Agreement shall be deposited with the Government of Norway which shall deliver certified copies thereof to each of the Governments referred to in paragraph I of this Article. The Depositary Government shall transmit certified copies of this Agreement to the Secretary-General of the United Nations for registration and publication in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

In Witness Whereof the undersigned, being duly authorized by their Governments, have signed this Agreement.

Done at Oslo, in the English and Russian languages, each text being equally authentic, this fifteenth day of November, 1973.

Appendix 4 – Overview and status for polar bear subpopulations worldwide

As reviewed by IUCN Polar Bear Specialist Group in Seattle 2005 and compiled by the Norwegian Polar Institute

The below map and table are the direct output on delineations and status of all circumpolar polar bear subpopulations made by the IUCN/Polar Bear Specialist Group at their 14th meeting in Seattle in 2005. The next meeting will be held in Copenhagen in summer 2009, where status for all subpopulations will be reviewed and updated.

Population map



NB = Northern Beaufort Sea
SB = Southern Beaufort Sea
VM = Viscount Melville
MC = M'Clintock Channel
NW = Norwegian Bay
LS = Lancaster Sound
GB = Gulf of Boothia
FB = Foxe Basin
WH = Western Hudson Bay
SH = Southern Hudson Bay
KB = Kane Basin
BB = Baffin Bay
DS = Davis Strait

Population status table

POPULATION	ABUNDANCE ESTIMATE	YEAR OF ESTIMATE	ANNUAL KILL (5-year mean)	TREND	STATUS	ESTIMATED RISK OF FUTURE DECLINE (10 years)
East Greenland	unknown	-	70	Data deficient	Data deficient	No estimate
Barents Sea	2997	2004	no catch	Data deficient	Data deficient	No estimate
Kara Sea	unknown	-	n/a	Data deficient	Data deficient	No estimate
Laptev Sea	unknown	-	n/a	Data deficient	Data deficient	No estimate
Chukchi Sea	2000	1993	n/a	Data deficient	Data deficient	No estimate
Southern Beaufort Sea	1800	1986	61	Decline	Reduced	No estimate
Northern Beaufort Sea	1200	1986	38	Stable	Not reduced	No estimate
Viscount Melville Sound	161	1992	4	Increase	Severely reduced	Very low
Norwegian Bay	190	1998	3	Decline	Not reduced	High
Lancaster Sound	2541	1998	72	Stable	Not reduced	High
M'Clintock Channel	284	2000	7	Increase	Severely reduced	Very low
Gulf of Boothia	1523	2000	39	Stable	Not reduced	Low
Foxe Basin	2197	1994	97	Stable	Not reduced	Low
Western Hudson Bay	935	2004	47	Decline	Reduced	Very high
Southern Hudson Bay	1000	1998	39	Stable	Not reduced	Low
Kane Basin	164	1998	10	Decline	Reduced	Very high
Baffin Bay	2074	1998	190	Decline	Reduced	Very high
Davis Strait	1650	2004	65	Data deficient	Data deficient	Low
Arctic Basin	unknown	-				

The abundance estimate for the Barents Sea population has later been adjusted from 2997 to 2650. There are also new numbers for some of the other populations, e.g. Southern Beaufort Sea. This subpopulation was estimated to be approx. 1526 individuals in 2006, an estimate that was based on data collected in the period 2001-2006.



Dag Vongraven
 Norwegian Polar Institute
vongraven@npolar.no

Appendix 5 – Lists of Participants

List of Participants – Members of party delegations

Title	Last name	First name	HOD	Job title	Organization	Country	E-mail address
Mrs.	Poter	Virginia	Yes	Director General	Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment Canada	Canada	Virginia.poter@ec.gc.ca
Mr.	Carpenter	Larry	No	Chair	Wildlife Management Advisory Council (North West Territories) Canada	Canada	wmacnwt@jointsec.nt.ca
Mr.	Dubois	John	No	Director	Wildlife and Ecosystem Protection, Government of Manitoba	Canada	Jack.Dubois@gov.mb.ca
Dr.	Lunn	Nick	No	Research Scientist	Environment Canada	Canada	Nick.Lunn@ec.gc.ca
Mr.	Pinksen	Steve	No	Director, Policy Planning and Legislation	Department of Environment, Government of Nunavut	Canada	SPinksen@gov.nu.ca
Mr.	Pokiak	Frank	No	Chair	Inuvialuit Game Council Canada	Canada	wmacnwt@jointsec.nt.ca
Mr.	van Havre	Basile	No	Director Population Conservation and Management	Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment Canada	Canada	basile.vanhavre@ec.gc.ca
Mrs.	Jessen	Amalie	Yes	Deputy Minister	Greenland Home Rule	Greenland	amalie@gh.gl
Dr.	Born	Erik W.	No	Senior Scientist	Greenland Institute of Natural Resources	Greenland	ewb@ghsdc.dk
Mr.	Hansen	Kaare Winther	No	Head of Section	Greenland Home Rule	Greenland	kwha@gh.gl
Mr.	Amirkhanov	Amirkhan	Yes	Deputy Director	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	Russia	amirkhanov@mnr.gov.ru
Dr.	Belikov	Stanislav	No	Head of Laboratory	All-Russian Research Institute for Nature Protection	Russia	sbelik40@mail.ru
Mr.	Etylin	Vladimir	No	Scientific Adviser	Association of Traditional Marine Mammal Hunters of Chukotka	Russia	Etylin.Vladimir@gmail.com
Ms.	Lerman	Olga	No	Chief specialist-expert	Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment	Russia	lerman@mnr.gov.ru
Mr.	Haskett	Geoffrey	Yes	Regional Director	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	USA	Geoff.Haskett@fws.gov
Dr.	Amtrup	Steven	No	Polar Bear Researcher	U.S. Geological Survey	USA	samstrup@usgs.gov
Dr.	DeBruyn	Terry	No	Polar Bear Project Leader	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	USA	terry_debruyn@fws.gov
Mr.	DeVincent	Stephen	No	Special Assistant/ ESA Coordinator	U.S. State Department	USA	devincentisj@state.gov
Mr.	Gosliner	Michael	No	General Counsel	Marine Mammal Commission	USA	mgosliner@mmc.gov
Mrs.	Hepa	Raynita	No	Director	North Slope Borough	USA	Taquiik.hepa@north-slope.org
Mr.	Lloyd	Denby	No	Commissioner	Alaska Department of Fish and Game	USA	Denby.lloyd@alaska.gov

Dr.	Meehan	Rosa	No	Division Chief, Marine Mammals Management	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	USA	rosa_meehan@fws.gov
Mr.	Johnson	Charles	No	Executive Director	Alaska Nanuq Commission	USA	Cj.aknanuug@alaska.com
Mrs.	Andenæs	Hege	Chair	Director General	Norwegian Ministry of the Environment	Norway	Hege.Andenas@md.dep.no
Mrs.	Bauer	Irene	No	Director	Norwegian Ministry of the Environment	Norway	Irene.Bauer@md.dep.no
Mr.	Ekker	Morten	No	Senior Adviser	Directorate for nature management	Norway	morten.ekker@gmail.com
Mr.	Johansen	Bjørn Fossli	No	Head of Environmental management and mapping department	Norwegian Polar Institute	Norway	bjorn.johansen@npolar.no
Mr.	Katerås	Finn	Yes	Head of International Division	Directorate for nature management	Norway	Finn.Kateras@dirnat.no
Mr.	Malme	Arne	No	Head of Environmental Section	Governor of Svalbard	Norway	arne.malme@sysselmannen.no
Mr.	Punsvik	Tor	No	Environmental Adviser	Governor of Svalbard	Norway	tor.punsvik@sysselmannen.no
Mr.	Svarte	Yngve	No	Assistant Director General	Directorate for nature management	Norway	Yngve.Svarte@dirnat.no
Mr.	Theisen	Fredrik Juell	No	Senior Adviser	Norwegian Ministry of the Environment	Norway	Fredrik-Juell.Theisen@md.dep.no
Mr.	Vongraven	Dag	No	Senior Adviser	Norwegian Polar Institute	Norway	dag.vongraven@npolar.no
Prof.	Wiig	Øystein	No	Professor	Natural History Museum, University of Oslo	Norway	oystein.wiig@nhm.uio.no
Dr.	Aars	Jon	No	Researcher	Norwegian Polar Institute	Norway	aars@npolar.no

List of Participants – PBSSG representatives and Norwegian organizers

Title	Last name	First name	Affiliation to meeting	Job title	Organization	Country	E-mail address
Mr.	Andersen	Magnus	Support staff (Norway)	Biologist	Norwegian Polar Institute	Norway	Magnus.Andersen@npolar.no
Dr.	Derocher	Andrew	PBSSG	Professor, Chair IUCN/SSC Polar Bear Specialist Group	Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta	Canada	derochet@ualberta.ca
Ms.	Dysvik	Solveig	Support staff (Norway)	Senior Adviser	Ministry of the Environment	Norway	solveig.dysvik@md.dep.no
Ms.	Einarson	Sigrun	Organizer	Senior Adviser	Directorate for Nature Management	Norway	Sigrun.Einarson@dirnat.no
Ms.	Einbu	Kristine	Support staff (Norway)	Student	University of Tromsø	Norway	Kristine.einbu@gmail.com
Dr.	Gerland	Sebastian	Invited speaker	Senior Research Scientist	Norwegian Polar Institute	Norway	gerland@npolar.no
Mr.	Halvorsen	Svein T.	Rapporteur	Senior Adviser	Ministry of the Environment	Norway	sth@md.dep.no
Ms.	Husby Talsnes	Hege	Organizer	Adviser	Directorate for Nature Management	Norway	Hege.Husby.Talsnes@dirnat.no
Mr.	Høyland	Tore	Organizer	Media Adviser	Directorate for Nature Management	Norway	Tore.Hoyland@dirnat.no
Ms.	Jensen	Silje-Kristin	Support staff (Norway)	Student	Norwegian Polar Institute	Norway	Silje-kristin.jensen@npolar.no
Ms.	Jones	Mary	Support staff (Norway)	Support staff (Norway)	Norwegian Polar Institute	Norway	mary.jones@sv.uit.no
Ms.	Kibsgaard	Anne	Organizer	Executive Secretary	Ministry of the Environment	Norway	aki@md.dep.no
Mr.	Larsen	Stein	Interpreter	Interpreter	Interpreter	Norway	Stein_larsen@yahoo.no
Ms.	Sandstø	Katerina	Interpreter	Interpreter	Interpreter	Norway	katerina.s@c2i.net
Dr.	Stirling	Ian	PBSSG	Research Scientist Emeritus and Adjunct Professor	Environment Canada and Department of Biological Sciences, University of Alberta	Canada	Ian.Stirling@shaw.ca

Ms.	Tchernova	Julia	Support staff (Norway)	Scientific Assistant	Norwegian Polar Institute	Norway	julia@npolar.no
Mr.	Tønset	Arne Egil	Support staff (Norway)	Media Adviser	Norwegian Polar Institute	Norway	tonset@npolar.no
Mr.	Vincent-Lang	Douglas	Support staff (USA)	Special Assistant/ESA Coordinator	Alaska Department of Fish & Game	USA	douglas.vincent-lang@alaska.gov
Ms.	Westheim	Karin	Support staff (Norway)	Senior Adviser	Ministry of the Environment	Norway	Karin.Westheim@md.dep.no

List of Participants – Observers

Title:	Last name	First name	Job title	Organization	Country	E-mail address
Ms.	Cutting	Amy	Advisory Council Member	Polar Bears International	USA	Amy.cutting@oregonzoo.org
Dr.	Ewins	Peter	Director, Species Conservation	WWF – Canada	Canada	pewins@wwfcanada.org
Mr.	Hansson	Rasmus	General Secretary	WWF – Norway	Norway	RHansson@wwf.no
Mr.	Iringaut	Paul	Wildlife Communications Advisor	Nunavut Tunngavik Inc.	Canada	amakpah@tunngavik.com
Dr.	Lockyer	Christina	General Secretary	North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission (NAMMCO)	Norway	christina.lockyer@nammco.no
Mr.	Nikiforov	Viktor	Programme Director	WWF – Russia	Russia	vnikiforov@wwf.ru
Mr.	Norris	Stefan	Consultant	WWF	Norway	snorrismac@mac.com
Ms.	Owen	Sian	Consultant	Sustainability Options Consulting	Netherlands	sianowen@planet.nl
Mr.	Sletner	Tor Christian	Program Leader High North	WWF – Norway	Norway	tcsltner@wwf.no
Mr.	Tesar	Clive	Head of Communications	WWF - Arctic Programme	Canada	ctesar@wwf.no
Mr.	York	Geoff	Polar Bear Coordinator	WWF - Arctic Programme	USA	geoff.york@wwfus.org
Ms.	Winsnes	Charlotte	Deputy Secretary	North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission (NAMMCO)	Norway	nammco-sec@nammco.no

List of Participants – Media

Title:	Last name	First name	Job title	Organization	Country	E-mail address
Mr.	Amundsen	Birger	Editor	Svalbardposten	Norway	birger@svabardposten.no
Mr.	Archer	John	Journalist	Reuters	Norway	John.Archer@thomsonreuters.com
Mr.	Bjørnbakk	Jan Morten	Journalist	NTB	Norway	jan.morten.bjornbakk@ntb.no
Mr.	Deshayes	Pierre-Henry	Journalist	Agence France-Presse (AFP)	Correspondent, Norway	Pierre-Henry.DESHAYES@afp.com
Mr.	Erofeev	Yury	Journalist	Kanal Rossia (GTRK Murman)	Russia	
Mrs.	Garfield	Marit	Journalist	NRK Troms og Finnmark	Norway	marit.kristin.garfield@nrk.no
Mr.	Gregersen	Reidar	Journalist	Bladet Tromsø	Norway	Reidar.Gregersen@itromso.no
Mrs.	Iversen	Tonje	Journalist	P4	Norway	tonje.iversen@p4.no
Mr.	Nabokin	Aleksei	Photographer (tv)	Kanal Rossia (GTRK Murman)	Russia	
Mr.	Pedersen	Jan Riise	Journalist	NRK Troms og Finnmark	Norway	jan.riise.pedersen@nrk.no
Mr.	Pettersen	Egil	Journalist	TV2	Norway	egil.pettersen@tv2.no
Mr.	Rapp	Ole Magnus	Journalist	Aftenposten	Norway	ole.magnus.rapp@aftenposten.no



Postal address:
P.O.Box 8013 Dep.
N-0030 Oslo, Norway
Phone: (+47) 22 24 90 90
Fax: (+47) 22 24 95 60
e-mail: postmottak@md.dep.no



Postal address:
N-7485 Trondheim, Norway
Phone: (+47) 73 58 05 00
Fax: (+47) 73 58 05 01
e-mail: postmottak@dirnat.no



Postal address:
Polar Environmental Centre,
N-9296 Tromsø, Norway
Phone: (+47) 77 75 05 00
Fax: (+47) 77 75 05 01
e-mail: post@npolar.no