

Panel Discussion

on Arctic Council and the Role of non-Arctic States

Possible talking points

Q1: Do you consider the Arctic Council is (should remain to be) (should in the future be) the premier intergovernmental* forum for making Arctic-specific legal orders? For all Arctic-specific issues? What are the merits and limitations, if any, of the Arctic Council in occupying such a place?

*As opposed to non-governmental fora such as Arctic Circle, Arctic Forum, etc. Other intergovernmental fora that may address Arctic-specific issues are bilateral fora, Arctic coastal states (A-5) fora, regional/functional fora by agreements (ex. Barents Council, PICES), universal/UN fora (ex. UNCLOS, IMO, COPs).

Q2: How do you consider the legitimacy and the authority of the Arctic Council being the premier intergovernmental forum for making Arctic-specific legal orders?

Q3: How do you consider the role of non-Arctic States in the Arctic Council becoming an important intergovernmental forum for making Arctic-specific legal orders? Should they be content to be observers in the process of Arctic legal order-making?

Q4: How do you foresee the future development of the discussion in the Arctic Council on the issue of “Observers’ Engagement”?

*12 current State observers: Germany, United Kingdom, Poland, the Netherlands, France, Spain, Italy, India, China, South Korea, Japan and Singapore

* 4 pending State observer applications: Turkey, Greece, Switzerland, Mongolia