



Symposium Summary Report

By Tina Melfjord, Information Officer, North Norway European Office, Michaela Wikdahl, Trainee, North Sweden European Office and Marianne Roed Abrahamsen, Intern, Arctic Consensus.

Introduction

The opening keynote session of the 2018 Arctic Futures Symposium, by **Mr. Piet Steel**, member of the Belgian Polar Secretariat and Former Ambassador of Belgium to Vietnam, was introduced by the Director for North Sweden European Office, **Mr. Mikael Jansson**. Mr. Steel pointed out that the first Arctic Futures Symposium took place in 2010, before regular Arctic events started to take place in Europe. There was an agreement that an Arctic conference was necessary to correct the number of myths about the Arctic. An example of these myths is that the Arctic is so fragile that it must be preserved, almost as an exhibit. But the Arctic is home to more than 4 million innovative people. The people living in the Arctic share the goal of wanting to make a common, sustainable future for themselves.

Mr. Steel continued by introducing the topic of this year's symposium; Arctic institutions; transport and logistics; culture; innovation and entrepreneurship; blue growth and biodiversity; and stories about living in the Arctic. He concluded his opening keynote by mentioning the Arctic Shorts on the 27. November, the first ever Arctic short film night at BOZAR, Brussels.

Ms. Marie-Anne Coninx, Ambassador at Large for the Arctic, European Union, also talked about the Arctic short film night that happened the night before, stressing the importance of showing Arctic stories made by Arctic people. Ambassador Coninx continued by giving praise to Finland for initiating the Northern Dimension, the first phase of Arctic cooperation. The process created a dialogue between the Arctic countries over 30 years ago, gathering the Arctic countries in Rovaniemi. The second phase, which prepared the way for the EU's first joint Communication on the Arctic, lasted until 2016.

We are now in the third phase, which requires careful attention, now that we know more about what is at stake. We know the challenges, we know that they are global, and that these challenges need to be addressed urgently. Safety and security is not a given anymore, and climate change is hitting the

Arctic first. Current Arctic policies might be insufficient to deal with these issues. We need a new way of thinking about the Arctic, and it needs to be with the Arctic people, she stated.

Robust and sustainable development of the Arctic requires careful thinking. We need conversation, not confrontation. We have to aim for more responsible approaches and an ambitious approach. The Arctic needs to be taken care of, while also developing the area. For these conversations, all stakeholders need to be involved.

Ambassador Coninsx closed her opening keynote by looking at the latest policy on the Arctic from the EU. She said that the EU should be proud of what has been achieved. All the major developments that are happening now requires strong will and inclusion of the EU in the years to come. The Arctic is a good place to have friends.

The third keynote speaker, **Elle Merete Omma**, EU Coordinator at the Sámi Council, continued by addressing the topic of logistics and transportation, and the effect this could have on Sámi lands in the Arctic. Highlighting that although it might not always seem that way, transportation and logistics are of vital importance to the Sámi people. Especially relating to the reindeer areas. Mining, industry and tourism are increasingly important today. What they have in common is the need for transportation though of Sámi lands. The Arctic corridor, which is proposed to connect the Mediterranean Sea with the Arctic, will go across Sámi lands.

From a Sámi perspective, the lack of discussions about the circular economy, or sustainability of Sámi lands in the transport discussions, is problematic. It is important to include indigenous peoples from an early stage in these discussions, to protect their interests, as well as ensure everyone's support for the project.

Ms. Omma continued by stressing the EU's responsibility to ensure the rights of indigenous peoples. She took the opportunity to use the rest of her keynote to explain why the proposed Arctic railway link between Rovaniemi, Finland and Kirkenes, Norway is not applauded by the Sámi Council. She pointed to the example of the northern railway in Norway, where on average, 390 reindeers are killed by trains every year. Taking into consideration that reindeer herding families have on average about 350 reindeer, this mortality statistic means that on average, an entire family's herd is lost every year. The strain this puts on people contributes to mental health issues among the Sámi people, especially the younger generation. Rapid modernisation and changing ways of living are also contributing factors that can lead to high suicide rates. This is why access to resources and access to development possibilities for Sámi youth is important.

Chair of the Standing Committee of Parliamentarians of the Arctic Region, **Mr. Erik Sivertsen** presented the four main points from the Arctic Parliamentary Conference in Inari, Finland in September 2018 in his keynote speech. The biennial conference represents the eight Arctic countries and the European Parliament. The four main points from the conference statement include suggestions on how the Arctic should be developed:

1. Digitalisation of the Arctic

High quality infrastructure is vital to develop the region. This includes health care, teaching, education, search and rescue, culture, and research. But it also includes the ability to stream TV-programmes in high definition. If the world is digital, the Arctic needs to be digital as well. This development should take place in a partnership between the public and the private sector, with a goal of affordable and easily available digital infrastructure.

2. Climate change and its effects on the Arctic and its people

Previously, we used to say that it is difficult to raise awareness of something you cannot see. The consequences of climate change are not coming, it is happening now, and we need to adapt to a new reality. The work of the Arctic Council to address these issues needs to be intensified. The climate crisis is hitting the Arctic first and hardest, but is not created by only the Arctic people, and therefore we cannot solve the problems in the Arctic alone.

3. Corporate and social responsibilities in the Arctic

The people living in the arctic must clearly see the advantages of living there, participating in innovative initiatives.

4. Social well-being for the people living in the Arctic.

Support and help for health issues can not be readily available in sparsely populated areas. More support and monitoring for e-health initiatives is necessary.

Mr. Jean Lemire, Special Envoy for Climate Change and Nordic Issues, Government of Québec continued the keynote session. He started by stressing that in the next two years, the countries of the world will have to set their own targets for saving the biodiversity. In the recent years, most species in the world have seen their populations drop by 60%. Over the next few months we will probably see a number of targets being set all over the world. Global biodiversity is not doing well; we need to be innovative to protect threatened species. We have to be bold in our actions, be innovative and push ourselves to create a new life for biodiversity. Mr. Lemire also pointed to the fact that the fast warming of the Arctic has huge effects on biodiversity. He also asked whether or not we are on the right track to respect the Paris Agreement. In addition, the challenges connected to biodiversity and climate change are tied closely together. We will need more than pretty pictures of polar bears to engage the people. We need to spread information about how climate change will change people's lives.

In some regions, the challenges of climate change will be difficult. The High Arctic might see radical changes. The biodiversity in the Arctic cannot move further north, if they are already at the top of the world. Every country will have to decide what part they will play. Mr. Lemire pointed to how the Province of Québec is working to solve these issues by protecting an increasing amount of land every year. Collaborating with the people living in the North will be vital. For the Arctic countries, protecting the North could represent an easy solution. But what would happen to those living in the North, and their development? We need to listen to them. Traditional knowledge is rich and often provides the solutions we need.

The second to last keynote speaker was **Mr. Tomas Norvoll**, President of Nordland County Council in Norway. He started his keynote by acknowledging the increasing attention to the Arctic over the last decade. He stated that this shift has been a good thing for the people representing the North. However, the focus can sometime be too narrow, and not always correct. He urged the audience to Google “the Arctic” and take a look at the pictures. They rarely show people, cities, or infrastructure, giving the impression that no one lives in the Arctic. The reality is quite different.

He also pointed to the different activities happening in Northern Norway, from Nord University and UiT, which specialise in Arctic research, and Bodø being shortlisted for the European Capital of Culture in 2024. This would be important for the entire northern Norway, connecting Europe and the Arctic together. These serve as examples that the Arctic is much more than ice and snow. The proposed new railway corridor between Rovaniemi and Kirkenes would be essential for the development of the Arctic. The Arctic should not be a museum. It should be for the people of the Arctic to decide to their common future, he stated.

The last keynote speaker was **Mr. Matti Anttonen**, Secretary of State at the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs. As several of the speakers before him, he stated that the Arctic is undergoing an unprecedented change. Warming climate, technology and globalisation are leading to a new reality for the people living in the Arctic. The region has become more connected and globalised than ever before. Mr. Anttonen continued by saying that the Finnish Chairmanship of the Arctic Council has made it possible to work towards some important goals, including reducing black carbon emissions. Finland will host a summit in the spring of 2019 that will discuss this issue, developing clear language on cooperation to tackle both black carbon emissions and other issues.

He argued that the EU needs to continue to show strong leadership to reach the goals of the Paris Agreement. We need many solutions, big and small. And we need to make sure that people can continue to live and develop in the North. Innovative cold climate technologies can benefit the Arctic and beyond. A more accessible Arctic needs more connectivity and infrastructure. Education and communication in sparsely populated areas would be easier with better connectivity. Connectivity needs to be high on the EU agenda to ensure this.

Panel 1 - How well are the Arctic institutions serving the needs of the Arctic and its people?

Moderators: **Dr. Andreas Raspotnik** (Senior Researcher the High North Centre, Nord University in Bodø, Norway and Fellow at the Fridtjof Nansen Institute in Oslo)
Dr. David Balton (Senior Fellow at the Wilson Center Polar Initiative)

Panellists: **René Söderman** (Senior Arctic Official of Finland)
Marie-Anne Coninsx (Ambassador at Large for the Arctic, European Union)
Bryndís Kjartansdóttir (Senior Arctic Official of Iceland)
Elle Merete Omma (EU Coordinator, Sámi Council)

Mininnguaq Kleist (Head of Representation, Greenland Representation to the EU)

The panel session was a roundtable discussion with representatives from Arctic Council nations' foreign ministries, Permanent Participants, and the European External Action Service. The session looked back on the past 25 years the Arctic Council has been developing. Moderator **Dr. Andreas Raspotnik**, Senior Researcher the High North Centre, Nord University in Bodø, Norway and Fellow at the Fridtjof Nansen Institute in Oslo led the discussion.

Mr. René Söderman, Senior Arctic Official of Finland, introduced the themes of peace, stability and constructive innovation in the Arctic in his opening remarks.

Ambassador Marie-Anne Coninx argued that there is a willingness of the observers in the Arctic Council (AC) to be more involved. She stated that it is important also to keep in mind that the AC is only one element of governance in the Arctic; there are also other fora to discuss burning issues. The work of the AC needs to be seen in a global patchwork of all institutions related to the arctic, observers and non-observers. She stated that inclusion is a keyword.

Ms. Bryndís Kjartansdóttir, Senior Arctic Official of Iceland, argued that there are many Arctic stakeholders: governments, businesses, universities, NGOs, indigenous peoples' organisations, and that they all have common needs. Common needs allow the inhabitants to continue to thrive and make use of the resources on their lands, and also adapt to the changes in climate. The institutions are addressing the challenges, and one could say the AC stands in the middle of the process. She continued with propositions to what the AC could look into: coordinate more work with science, and provide more funding to Arctic stakeholders. The AC could enhance its profile with regard to the Arctic Ocean.

Ms. Elle Merete Omma, EU Coordinator, Sámi Council, said that the AC raises questions of human rights as an organisation. The AC model allows stakeholders - including indigenous peoples - to sit at the same table as equals. Perhaps it is time for a reform, but if the AC is to be developed and strengthened, we need to strengthen indigenous peoples' Arctic institutions. Only if the organisations are strengthened, we can strengthen the AC.

Mr. Mininnguaq Kleist, Head of Representation, Greenland Representation to the EU, mentioned that many organizations apart from the AC have sprung up in recent years. It shows that the Arctic is not a vacuum – there are many organisations focusing on science, environment and people, and the important thing is that people live there and have to be able to make a living in the Arctic. Greenland has worked with and supported the AC Sustainable Development Working Group (SDWG). The AC has developed and these working groups have been developing along with it. It is important not to lose the spirit of the work of the AC as this is one of the only forums where you work with indigenous peoples as permanent participants, and it is important not to change that. It is a very practical region, and the involvement is important to keep in mind in when reforming the AC.

Panel discussion 1

*Panel discussion moderator **Dr. David Balton**, Senior Fellow at the Wilson Center Polar Initiative, asked the panelists a question about the structural change of the Arctic Council: If the Arctic Council was built today, would it be built differently?*

Mr. René Söderman: There should still be relevance on environment. There has been a development of the council from a science to a policy forum. The weakness is that the policy actions are developed at the ministerial level and not followed up on a national level. It is a consensus forum. It has been working well these 20 years, but the expectations for the AC have also been increasing.

Ms. Elle Omma: The work of the AC has increased, but not the funding options for the indigenous peoples. If the AC cannot keep up, then they may lose these options for the indigenous peoples.

Ambassador Marie-Anne Coninx: There has been an increase of projects in the AC secretariat. They are doing great work. Yet for an outsider it seems that they need more resources. There is no suggestion that the structure should change, but perhaps it may need adaptations to be inclusive. One must ask if it is evolving enough.

Mr. Mininnguaq Kleist: Should the AC be strengthened from outside or inside states? For many of the state members of Arctic Council, the capitals are not in the Arctic. Therefore, policies are often implemented at a distance. There are different dynamics in the different states, and maybe we should think more about the structure in this perspective.

Ambassador Bryndis Kjartansdottir: Yes, the structure would look differently if the AC was created today.

Moderator **Dr. David Balton** then asked the panelists: There are many 'spin-off' forums and three binding agreements, as well as other agreements (polar shipping code, Arctic fishing etc.). Does this need coordination or is this web that we have created adequate for the future?

Mr. Söderman answered that one thing has not changed in the Arctic: only 10% of Arctic territory is within governments' jurisdiction. He welcomed the fishery agreements stating that it is a good way to ensure sustainable fishing.

Ambassador Coninx argued that the proliferation of the policies is not a negative thing. It does not have to be done only by the AC. She argued that in an EU context, we would call it subsidiary principle that the AC focuses on what they can do, and others do something also.

Ms. Omma stated that if we can use it as an avenue to enhance indigenous peoples' rights – then yes, it is positive.

Mr. Kleist stated that much of the changes are not from what happens in the Arctic, but from outside. We should keep things at a size where you can have the events in the Arctic – and ask how to keep it in the Arctic. You have to be close to what you talk about and deal with it from there, because already the nation state capitals are often not in the Arctic.

Questions from the audience: Is it a double thing to be inclusive - bringing a lot of confrontational issues in the Arctic Council e.g. by including observers such as China?

Ambassador Coninx answered that it will not increase risks; it will decrease risks bringing people to the discussions. It is also important that China engages in climate change issues, so they should be there also.

Panel discussion 2

Panelists: **Bård Ivar Svendsen** (Special Adviser / Ambassador for Arctic and Antarctic Affairs at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Norway)

Björn Lyrvall (Ambassador for Arctic Affairs, Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs)

Leigh McCumber (Senior Policy Officer, Canadian International Arctic Centre)

Elin Mortensen (Head of Mission, Mission of the Faroes to the European Union)

Bridget Larocque (Sustainable Development Working Group, Arctic Athabaskan Council)

In the second part of the panel session, moderator **Dr. David Balton**, Senior Fellow, Wilson Center Polar Initiative, continued to investigate the same questions with a different panel.

In his opening remarks, **Ambassador Bård Ivar Svendsen**, Special Adviser / Ambassador for Arctic and Antarctic Affairs at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Norway, expressed that he is glad that the focus of the AC is on the people of the Arctic. About 10% of Norway's population lives in the Arctic and many have been there for centuries. For Norwegians, sustainable development is always an issue. The Arctic is a place for activity and traditions, and there is also potential for improvement for the AC. He stated that there is not really a need to reform the structure from his point of view, but room for improvement.

Ambassador Björn Lyrvall, Ambassador for Arctic Affairs, Swedish Ministry for Foreign Affairs, continued saying that his immediate response would be: yes, indeed. We have an AC that has served us well and continues to do so, even being nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize. Yet there is a need for more 'peer review'. It needs stronger involvement of actors outside the Arctic region, because

everyone is in this together. However the AC should be kept as the primary institution, and it has a lot to offer.

Following up on his comments, **Ms. Leigh McCumber**, Senior Policy Officer, Canadian International Arctic Centre, stated that for Canada, the AC is the preeminent forum for Arctic cooperation. She argued that it has changed since it was started in 1988 from having a policy-shaping to a policy-making role. It has a more holistic and sustainable development approach. The role of indigenous peoples's participation in the AC is a very unique value of the organisation. It must work to increase the involvement of Permanent Participants (PPs). For Canada, it is important to maintain focus on the human dimension. There is a two-way dialogue between the AC and indigenous peoples – there is a need to know that they know what they do, and also that the work is represented by the PPs.

Ms. Elin Mortensen, Head of Mission, Mission of the Faroes to the European Union, stated that it is only in the last 10 years that we have discussed sustainable issues in the AC forum. It is remarkable to have key stakeholders and PPs at the table. It is also a value to have the observers in the AC – not least the EU. It is not possible for the AC to consider and implement all projects that might come out of the AC's work within each chairmanship. Here there is need for better coordination and prioritising. For each proposed project, we should consider if there are available resources, and are the activities relevant for the people living in the Arctic.

Ms. Bridget Larocque, Sustainable Development Working Group, Arctic Athabaskan Council, started by telling that there is need for stressing the importance of the indigenous voice in research and institutions. Our collective institutional memory needs to be taken into account: why we created the Arctic Council in the first place. The institutions were created to have indigenous peoples' voices heard in an international forum. The important policies for indigenous peoples often do not reach discussion on the national level; we have "silo thinking". If you don't live in the Arctic, it is hard to feel what Arctic indigenous peoples feel. While there are high suicide rates and long polar nights, we still love our lands. The human dimension is imperative. I am only one voice and I am one voice of many marginalised indigenous peoples. The most important thing is to really listen to indigenous peoples, not just take notes on your laptop. We have respect and love for our homelands and that is what being indigenous means to me. Changes have to happen within the Arctic Council, and the observers have to be able to provide adequate engagement on important issues. We need more than just funding.

Moderator David Balton asked the panelists the question: What concretely can be done to have more involvement of indigenous peoples, to keep the special value of the Arctic Council?

Mr. Bård Ivar Svendsen stressed that it is extremely important to involve Arctic indigenous peoples in the discussions, and that it is sometimes a very basic question of funding. Norway has a lot of funding that could be applied to other AC member states.

Ms. Larocque answered him back that money is important to get us to the table. But that it is also important to engage indigenous peoples on the level of science. There appears to be a thought that all we have is indigenous knowledge. However, a lot of indigenous peoples have attained higher degrees from Western institutions. Those voices have to be heard as well. Money helps a lot – it helps us get there. But it also helps if the outsiders travel to the Arctic. Not a lot of significance is given to our

traditional views. Huge resources get sent when a catastrophe happens other places in the world. Yet in the Arctic we have a high suicide rate, and there is not a lot being done from a policy or investment side. We need to help our teachers, elders and families. We are scattered as indigenous peoples because of colonisation. And we need to be more connected.

Questions from the audience included: There is a constellation of institutions and the AC plays an important role. How can the coordination among the Arctic players be improved?

Mr. Svendsen: This is the million-dollar question. The good thing is that there is an interest. How do we coordinate with all the good initiatives? There is no easy answer to that. Mainly the Arctic Council will have to look at that. The observer status states also, including the EU, which has an informal observer status at the AC.

Ms. Larocque: We have to ensure that all our interest groups have the ability to report back to us through a meaningful process. It needs to be done in a professional way so we send the most qualified members of our communities to handle different issues.

Ms. Mortensen: With the immense interest in the Arctic, this is an important question, how the states are engaging. Sometimes the different representatives don't speak together. It is a challenge even in the smaller countries. We need to strengthen cooperation and also ask if what we are doing is economically helping the Arctic?

Ms. McCumber: We can look internally what we do at home at different levels of government. It would help. Canada continues to support the status of giving observer status to the EU.

Another question from the audience was: What is the cause of the high suicide rates in the Arctic and how can we turn things around for the next generation?

Ms. Larocque answered that suicide is an intergenerational trauma right now. Through colonisation, children have been taken away from their parents to go to school. The children got lost without their parents' love and indigenous language. The children got put into institutions and were forbidden to speak their own language. There are also issues such as contaminants in our land and water. The contaminants get into our food, and because of them, we can't even breastfeed our children. If we can't have our fish, caribou and birds, of course we are going to feel depleted. And we also live in isolated areas and were forced to settle. These policies have broken down families. There is no one cause and I doubt there is one answer to the problems. But human health needs to have a prominent place on the agenda.

Panel 2 - Connecting the Arctic: Transport and logistics

- Moderator:** **Harri Mäki-Reinikka** (Secretary-General of Finland's Arctic Advisory Board; Ambassador and Special Adviser on northern policies at Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs' Arctic Team)
- Panelists:** **Kjell Stokvik** (Managing Director, High North Centre for Logistics)
Mårten Edberg (Infrastructure strategist, Västerbotten Region)
Jóhanna á Bergi (Director, Atlantic Airways)
Jacob Nitter Sørensen (CEO, Air Greenland)
Cécile Pelaudeix (Associate Researcher, PACTE Science Po, University of Grenoble)

This session looked at transport within the Arctic region and from the Arctic to the rest of the world. Transport in the Arctic is important. There is a lot of money going to the railways within the EU. It will cost 500 million Euros to build the railroads needed in the EU within 12 years, but more money is needed for the Arctic.

There are some good examples of important and needed infrastructure projects in the Arctic. One is the Arctic Corridor, which is a global economic region as well as a transport and development corridor. It connects Finland and Europe to the deep-water ports of the Arctic Ocean, large production areas of oil and gas, and the western end of the Northern Sea Route where the Sámi people were included in the negotiations on this corridor in Finland. Some other important projects are the North Bothnia Line, which is a planned high-speed railway line between Umeå and Luleå in Sweden. Yet another example is the extension of the Scandinavian-Mediterranean Core Network Corridor, also called the Bothnian extension, from Stockholm along the coast line in northern Sweden including the East Coast Line and the North Bothnia Line, and further along the Iron Ore Line to the Swedish-Norwegian border to connect to Narvik and through the Haparanda Line to the Swedish/Finnish border passage at Haparanda-Tornio.

Mr. Kjell Stokvik, Managing Director of High North Centre for Logistics introduced his organisation, the Centre for High North Logistics, which was founded on 27 May 2009, succeeding a previous organisation that had been set up in 2008 and administered by Bodø University College. It was established to find energy and mineral resources in the Arctic and find ways of transporting them. It is important to map transport to know where infrastructure projects are needed. The Centre for High North Logistics maps the land and maritime transport with a focus on the transportation of raw materials in the Barents Region. An important part of transportation planning is taking input from the indigenous peoples, which should always be a part of any negotiations. The Centre also keeps in mind reducing carbon emissions in its planning. A key aspect of infrastructure planning in the Arctic is to not only focus on railways in the Arctic, but also look at the possibility of connecting with the rest of Europe as well as making east-west connections between the Barents Region countries.

Mr. Mårten Edberg, an infrastructure strategist from Västerbotten Region in Sweden, opened by stating that there is a growing interest for infrastructure planning in northern parts of Europe, not least with the strong partnership between Norway, Sweden, Finland and within the Barents Region.

Emphasis is placed on the transport needs and potential benefits of the transport system in northern Sweden, keeping in mind economic regional growth, sustainability and competence supply. Northern Sweden has worked to develop the transport system within the EU's TEN-T and transport policy. There has been good cooperation with DG MOVE at the EU Commission DG MOVE, especially Pat Cox, Catherine Trautmann and Brian Simpson.

Cécile Pelaudeix Associate Researcher, PACTE Science Po, University of Grenoble, discussed the EU Commission's proposal to extend the corridor network to the northern parts of Norway, Sweden and Finland represents an important strategic entry for the EU to the Arctic. Ms. Pelaudeix also emphasised the importance of linking Europe's northern areas to one another so that the EU gets an entry into the Arctic. Nations must put more effort into the Arctic issues and the issues must be seen both in policy documents and in the negotiations about the infrastructure investments.

Ms. Jóhanna á Bergi, Director of Atlantic Airways, talked about their important role to connect the Faroe Islands with the rest of Europe. The Faroe Islands are dependent of the fishing industry. But now tourism is an up-and-coming industry. Today there are 1500 possibilities per year to travel to, or from, the Faroe Islands. Connectivity and transport are particularly important for the Faroes, being a group of tiny islands in the North Atlantic. The tourism sector is becoming more important to the Faroe Islands and now they need to develop strategies to make travel and tourism more sustainable.

The CEO of Air Greenland, **Mr. Jacob Nitter Sørensen**, also talked about the importance of transport. Sustainability is a challenge for Greenland, since the country is dependent on air travel in and out of Greenland. Air Greenland's mission is to make Greenland accessible. Mr. Sørensen also mentioned the Greenland Parliament's proposals to upgrade airports in Nuuk and Ilulissat to meet future projected needs.

Of note in the following discussion there was a question whether it is possible to build railways in Europe without involvement or investment from China. The panel had different opinions on this question. Some thought that Chinese involvement is a possibility to consider, while others thought it could be too risky to involve them.

Panel 3 - Culture, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship

Moderator: **Anu Fredrikson** (Director, Arctic Economic Council Secretariat)

Panelists: **Dieter Müller** (Deputy Vice-Chancellor responsible for research, postgraduate education and outreach within the social sciences and humanities, Umeå University)
Hayley A. Henning (Vice-President for sales and marketing, Greenland Ruby A/S)
Bridget Larocque (Sustainable Development Working Group, Arctic Athabaskan Council)

Sandra Márjá West (Director, Riddu Riđđu Festival)

Anne Lajla Utsi (CEO, International Sámi Film Institute)

Sóley Hammer (Director, Hugskotið)

The third panel focused on how culture and innovation could foster entrepreneurship in Arctic communities. The panel explored the barriers entrepreneurs meet in the Arctic, and what can be done to overcome these barriers, as well as how individuals can contribute to a more entrepreneurial culture and facilitate culture as a business. The panel consisted of a range of different actors within the fields of culture and entrepreneurship including marketing, targeted working groups, indigenous culture festival management, and filmmaking.

Mr. Dieter Müller, Deputy Vice-Chancellor responsible for research, postgraduate education and outreach within the social sciences and humanities at Umeå University, stated “The North has always been innovative; we have to be in order to live there.” He pointed to the cultural revitalisation happening in the Arctic. However, when talking about development and culture, it is important to remember that there can be very big differences between different Arctic regions, even in the same country. From a European perspective, when you look at innovation, the North is innovative. One of the challenges however, is that working in cultural fields is often considered to be outside the norm of what is considered to be a “good job”.

Arctic entrepreneurship exists in a range of shapes and sizes, from mining of red rubies in Greenland, to an indigenous festival in Norway. What the panellists had in common was the concern over an available, qualified workforce. Lack of basic societal services in rural areas, little to no opportunities to get education without moving away, and few career opportunities were mentioned as challenges necessary to overcome. Infrastructure, cross-border cooperation, space for entrepreneurs to work and cooperate, and local governments facilitating education and societal services were mentioned as important means to improve this.

The panellists had a number of examples of how entrepreneurship is possible in the Arctic, from large industries to small startups.

Ms. Hayley A. Henning, Vice-President for sales and marketing, Greenland Ruby A/S, described how their mining company, which runs a ruby mine in Aappaluttoq in southwest Greenland, strives to adhere to ethical, social, human rights, and environmental laws and responsible practices. They believe in a constant learning process, engaging in dialogue with local officials, hiring local workers, having minimal impact on the environment, and looking for ways to give back to the local communities in Greenland. They aim to avoid past mistakes of other large mining companies that have operated in the Arctic.

Ms. Bridget Larocque and **Ms. Sandra Márjá West** both spoke about the importance from Arctic indigenous peoples to revive and keep their culture alive. The world has become digital, and connectivity is therefore important also for them. Products are sold via Facebook, advertisement for the Riddu Riddu happens on social media for example. **Sandra Márjá West** told the audience about the eradication of the Sámi people in Northern Norway, and how this led to a need to restore pride and community among people who have felt shame for so long. This resulted in the creation of the Riddu Riddu festival. The people starting the festival were entrepreneurs. They saw a problem and found the solution. Another example came from **Ms. Anne Lajla Utsi**, who, when she was not able to receive funding to make Sámi films from the Norwegian Film Institute, started the Sámi Film Institute.

Globally, everyone is looking to the Arctic, talking about climate change and its effects. To overcome these challenges, it is important to listen to the indigenous peoples, because they have been living on the land for centuries.

Ms. Sóley Hammer from the Faroe Islands manages, Hugskotið, an organisation that encourages entrepreneurship. This organisation has made it possible for starting entrepreneurs to have an office space and receive vital support. Interest in entrepreneurship is high, as 39 of the 40 office spaces they are currently filled. She pointed out that strategic and patient work over time made this possible.

Panel 4 - Blue growth and biodiversity: prospects and challenges

Moderator: **Andreas Østhagen** (Research Fellow, Fridtjof Nansen Institute; Senior Fellow, Leadership Group, the Arctic Institute)

Panelists: **Kjell Kristian Egge** (International Law Adviser of the Law of the Sea, Norwegian Foreign Ministry)
Henrik Leth (Chairman, Polar Seafood Greenland A/S)
Alessia Clochiatti (Policy Officer, DG MARE)
Elin Mortensen (Head of Mission, Mission of the Faroes to the European Union)
Frode Nilssen (Professor, Head of the Department of Marketing, Strategy and Management, Business School - High North Centre for Business and Governance)

The fourth session looked at blue growth potential in the Arctic and sub-Arctic region within the context of sound ocean governance.

Moderator **Dr. Andreas Østhagen**, Research Fellow at the Fridtjof Nansen Institute and the Arctic Institute, started out by explaining the blue economy in the Arctic for those who were not familiar.

Mr. Kjell Kristian Egge stated that there is more than one Arctic; there are huge differences between Murmansk, Nuuk, Iqaluit, Tromsø and Anchorage. People work and live in the Arctic and that the jurisdiction of the central Arctic Ocean is based on the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Agreement to prevent unregulated high seas Fisheries in the Central Arctic Ocean, IMO instruments and various regional instruments. We have the legal framework – applied to both the Arctic Ocean and the rest of the world. There are, however, issues in the oceans: plastic pollution and unsustainable use of the ocean's living resources. It is hoped that the new UN assembly agreement on biodiversity in the oceans will become a tool and contribute to a more sustainable use of the ocean. As it stands now, it will become a place of jurisdiction which will apply for all the convention – and it will have an impact on the Arctic Ocean. The mechanism needs to step up: there is a group in the Arctic Council working on ocean management. Norway hopes for this group to create a framework to solve future challenges. To remain the most important mechanism, the Arctic Council needs to remain up to date with what is asked and needed.

Mr. Henrik Leth, Chairman, Polar Seafood Greenland A/S, stated that it is important for Greenland that there is EU involvement in Arctic fisheries management because Greenland is in need of inspiration and intervention from the outside world. He explained that Polar Seafood is the largest private company in Greenland and that it has offices in Russia, Denmark, and Greenland. There is a Sustainable Fisheries Group in Greenland, so the discussion about the blue economy is relevant to his business. New fish species not native to the Arctic such as herring, mackerel and capelins are coming as warming ocean waters encourage fish stocks to migrate. Polar Seafood Greenland has invested many million Euros to catch the fish and sometimes runs into conflict with other nations which used to fish these species before they migrated, as they believe the fish stocks still belong to them. Greenland is actually benefiting from global warming in this regard.

Another point he brought up was that we cannot only focus on the possibilities, as the projects are costly. For example, off the east coast of Greenland it is not possible to put a plant there and create a project, as there are few people, there is no infrastructure and the sea is a very big area to cover. The potential is not as obvious as people living in capitals might think. For the large-scale projects, Polar Seafood Greenland either needs a lot of knowhow or a lot of raw material, and without these, it can be difficult. The fishing industry in Greenland is not able to do nearly as much as the fishing industries in Iceland and Norway. Therefore, it is important to focus on small-scale projects that can benefit local populations. When the company produced Greenland halibuts more than 20 years ago, after the meat and the oil were taken, a lot of the fish was thrown away. Now the company uses almost 90% of the halibut. The head and tails can be sent to China and other countries to be used in agriculture, for example. In Greenland, it is important to recognise potential markets so the country can sell what is normally wasted. It is very important to not only focus on what is possible now, but what might be possible in the future.

Ms. Alessia Clochiatti, Policy Officer at DG MARE, continued with an overview of how the EU is working on the blue economy. She remarked that there is potential in the oceans, but we are in trouble. The last ICC report documents a warming and acidification of the oceans, diminishing

availability of fresh water on land, a growing human population, and reduced biodiversity. In light of all these, it is important to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, make use of the circular economy and be ready to adapt to the changes taking place in the oceans.

EU priorities include the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and investments in Arctic research. The blue economy has many definitions: aquaculture, biotechnology, shipbuilding, renewable energy etc. In the coming years, the EU will invest much more in offshore offshore wind, wave and tidal energy production. Aquaculture platforms also have great potential.

The EU established the Ocean Energy Forum to hear what stakeholders in this area are interested in. The Ocean Energy 2030 scenario explains optimistic investments and cumulative effects. A lot of our global fisheries and aquaculture potential is untapped: only 50% of crustacean stocks are currently used, and for shellfish, even more are unused. There is potential in bioprospecting.

Cruise tourism and blue ocean tourism is increasing a lot. The EU holds regional cruise dialogues, including one on the Arctic. Tools to boost the blue economy include the EU Blue Economy call for tender: Blue Careers, Blue Labs, Grants for Innovation (deadline 31 January 2018). Researchers and young scientists can apply and be given grants to upscale their products or research. Another tool is the European Fund for Strategic Investments (EFSI), an investment readiness and matchmaking platform. Different NGOs have together with the European Commission developed 14 principles, a “Declaration of the sustainable blue economy finance principles” to persuade industry to develop more sustainable investments in the blue economy. These principles are equally relevant for the Arctic.

Ms. Elin Mortensen, Head of Mission, Mission of the Faroes to the European Union, emphasised that fisheries are crucial to the benefit of the Faroese people. Almost 20% of the country’s GDP is from fisheries, and 50% of the export values are from fish farming in the Faroes. However, it is important to be conscious of sustainable harvesting of biological resources, Ms. Mortensen stated. It is important to explore new and underdeveloped areas and take the lead in marine innovation, such as vessels being required to land all parts of the fish. Additionally, ocean-based seaweed production has been made possible due to a change in legislation.

A large ocean nation is what the Faroes prefer to call themselves. Instead of focusing on the small land mass, the country focuses on growth in the ocean economy. A Faroese delegation just participated in the blue growth conference in Malta, and plan a forum on the Faroes next year to promote blue growth, agriculture and blue fashion. The marine industry and the fashion industry working together can be a win-win situation. The signing of the Central Arctic Ocean Fisheries Agreement in Ilulissat in October 2018 is an important first step to ensure well-regulated fisheries in the Arctic ocean.

Mr. Frode Nilssen, Professor, Head of the Department of Marketing, Strategy and Management, at the Business School of the High North Centre for Business and Governance, stated that the exploration of the sea is still a very new thing. The other new thing is trade. The blue economy represents three things:

- Harvesting and trade of marine living resources
- Extraction and use of marine non-living resources
- Commerce and trade in and around the oceans (e.g. transportation)

The blue economy is so important because it can supply the world with food. Only 29 % of the world is land, and 71 % is sea. Global population is projected grow to 9.8 billion people by 2050. They will need to be fed somehow. There are large agricultural regions in the sea where we can produce food via aquaculture. The total wild catch population is quite stable and unlikely to be increased, so the only way we can increase food production in the sea is by aquaculture.

How can we create a sustainable creation of value? Biotechnology, aquaculture, ecology and genomics. Other food production systems also use soy protein, and Norway is looking towards using algae for feeding salmon.

The panelists' remarks were followed by a Panel discussion including the question: *Is it considered sustainable if fish farming might have some negative environmental consequences?*

Ms. Mortensen: The question is discussed a lot in the Faroes. There are consequences, but it is also a question of producing high quality food. **Mr. Nilssen** mentioned that the problems are also related to the areas of the sea. The sea has been common ground, and people want the sea to be untouched.

Another question from the audience was: *Many of the panelists have mentioned the blue ocean etc. but very few have talked about the people who live there: When you look at the Arctic and the investments in the blue economy, from where are you going to hire employees and ensure their working conditions?*

Mr. Leth said that in his industry, they don't always have all the kinds of profiles they need in their business, so they often make outside hires, or "klondikes". **Ms. Clocchiatti** continued by saying jobs is one of the key challenges in attracting talented employees who are willing to work in the Arctic.

Closing Statements

Kirsti Methi, Arctic Ambassador, City of Tromsø, recounted the different topics addressed during the day. The people of the Arctic should have a stronger voice in the development of Arctic in the future. Representatives from local and regional authorities should be involved in future discussions. We can see that many non-Arctic countries are knocking on the door to be observants of the Arctic Council, with China as an example. The future of the Arctic depends on how it develops and how investments are made. However, these investments will affect the nature and the people, so the people of Arctic should have a strong voice in the discussions about the policies made. Arctic democracy should involve all stakeholders for social, local and cultural sustainability. Looking to the future, the Arctic must be a vibrant and developing region.

Mr. Kristian Leffler, Deputy Secretary General for Economic and Global Issues at the European External Action Service, delivered the last keynote of the day. He stated that the debates during the

day were a great foundation for further discussions on the Arctic in the European Commission. To mention one thing among many, we can see that the interest in the Arctic has increased at many levels and not least on the EU level. Also, several countries far away from the Arctic have developed a great interest for the Arctic region. There is fantastic potential in the transport sector in the Arctic, and the accessibility and connectivity of the Arctic to the rest of Europe and the world is important. Infrastructure is expensive and difficult; it is therefore important to be careful and smart when selecting the right projects to move forward. The best projects are not necessarily always traditional infrastructure projects.

The debates held during the day show that the Arctic has large amounts of confidence, history, knowledge and culture, and that the Arctic is developing in its own way. They have also shown that sustainability, biodiversity and blue economy are important topics for the Arctic people. Forums like the Arctic Futures Symposium have given a lot of inputs, new angles, inspiration and exchange with other colleagues to bring into the future.