

ANNEX E

Report of the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP XI)

Report of the Committee for Environmental Protection (CEP XI)

Kyiv, June 2–6, 2008

Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

- (1) The CEP Chair, Dr Neil Gilbert (New Zealand), opened the meeting on Monday 2 June 2008. The Chair thanked Ukraine for arranging and hosting the meeting, as well the Secretariat of the Antarctic Treaty for its support during the intersessional period.
- (2) The Chair joined Brazil in expressing deep sadness of the death of Dr Edith Fanta and noted her many years of support for Antarctic work, particularly through her role as chair of CCAMLR's Scientific Committee. The Committee stopped in silent reflection for Dr Fanta and those who lost their lives in Antarctica over the past year.
- (3) The Chair summarised the work undertaken since CEP X. The Chair noted that a number of intersessional groups had been established at CEP X to deal with, respectively, the five-year work plan, the review of Management Plans (through the Trial Informal Group), the review of the draft CEE from China, preparation of a model action plan for Specially Protected Species, the Electronic Information Exchange System (EIES) and the status of southern giant petrels in accordance with Resolution 2 (2007). The Chair thanked those who had participated and noted that the outcomes of these intersessional groups would be discussed further throughout the meeting.
- (4) The Chair also noted his attendance on behalf of the Committee at the 26th CCAMLR Scientific Committee Meeting, noting that his report would be discussed under agenda item 14.

Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

(5) The Committee adopted the following agenda and confirmed the allocation of papers to Agenda Items:

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Adoption of Agenda
3. Strategic Discussions on the Future Work of the CEP
4. Operation of the CEP
5. International Polar Year
6. Environmental Impact Assessment
 - a) Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations
 - b) Other EIA Matters

7. Area Protection and Management
 - a) Management Plans
 - b) Historic Sites and Monuments
 - c) Site Guidelines
 - d) Systematic Environmental Geographic Framework
 - e) Other Annex V Matters
8. Conservation of Antarctic Fauna and Flora
 - a) Quarantine and Non-native Species
 - b) Specially Protected Species
 - c) Marine Acoustics
 - d) Other Annex II Matters
9. Environmental Monitoring and Reporting
 - a) Climate Change
 - b) Other Environmental Monitoring and Reporting Matters
10. Inspection Reports
11. Emergency Response and Contingency Planning
12. Waste Management
13. Prevention of Marine Pollution
14. Cooperation with Other Organisations
15. General Matters
16. Election of Officers
17. Preparation for Next Meeting
18. Adoption of the Report
19. Closing of the Meeting

(6) The Committee considered 46 Working Papers, 64 Information Papers and 4 Secretariat Papers (Annex 1, page 453).

Item 3: Strategic Discussions on the Future of the CEP

(7) Australia presented WP 17 *Preparation for Scheduled CEP Discussions: Reviews of Past Activities*, proposing two ideas for improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the Committee. Australia recommended that the Committee consider having a topic summary prepared in advance of discussions scheduled through the five-year work plan, noting that Australia's IP 7 (submitted under agenda item 9b), summarising past discussions and

agreements on environmental monitoring and reporting, was an example. Australia suggested that such summaries would aid the Committee's debates by acting as a reminder of past discussions, and that such topic summaries could be prepared, as required, by the Secretariat and / or willing Members.

(8) Australia also proposed that Members include an abstract at the start of each Working and Information Paper, to assist with the preparation of topic summaries and with Members' review of papers for each meeting.

(9) The Committee supported the proposal for Working and Information Papers to include an abstract that would highlight the key aspects and proposals or recommendations contained in the paper. The Committee noted that such abstracts could be used by the Chair and Secretariat in preparing an annotated agenda for the Committee.

(10) There was general agreement to Argentina's suggestion that Working Papers ideally should include a clear recommendation, or a clear question for discussion.

(11) Members also agreed in principle with Australia's proposal for topic summaries to be prepared, if required. Some Members posed questions about the time that would be required to prepare such topic summaries, whether they would be required for all items on the CEP's agenda, and the potential impact on the Secretariat's resources.

(12) Australia responded that in its view topic summaries would be an additional tool to support the CEP's five-year work plan and that the need for such topic summaries should be considered on a case-by-case basis.

(13) The Secretariat indicated that it would be willing to prepare topic summaries, but that the Committee should clearly define the scope of the summary, on which topics they would be required and by what deadline. Connected with this, France suggested to add a link to the original documents when possible.

(14) The Committee agreed that topics could be selected from the five-year work plan and that the Secretariat and willing volunteers could be asked to prepare topic summaries and make them available on the CEP website, well in advance of the meeting at which the topic would be discussed, so as to assist Parties in their preparations.

(15) Noting the large and increasing number of papers presented to the Committee, France suggested that one possible alternative to discussion of Information Papers at the meeting would be to make them available on the CEP website for discussion by Members via an on-line forum.

(16) The Secretariat responded that whilst such an approach would be technically possible, this could be resource intensive due to the large number of Information Papers. ASOC also noted that invited experts can only introduce Information Papers. As such, an on-line discussion forum would preclude discussion of all papers submitted from those invited experts. Several Members indicated a desire for more time to consider this proposal.

(17) France agreed to reflect further on the idea during the intersessional period with other interested Members for possible further consideration at the next Meeting.

(18) New Zealand introduced WP 24 *Improving the CEP's Role in Advising the ATCM on the State of Antarctic Environments* recalling lengthy discussions on how the CEP might meet one of its core functions of advising the ATCM on the state of the Antarctic environment as required by Article 12 (1) (J) of the Protocol. New Zealand suggested that it could be argued that the Committee is already going some way towards meeting this requirement, in that regular meetings and intersessional work of the Committee have provided a significant body of advice to the ATCM. Modifying CEP's working practices would help to ensure that it is dealing with priority issues in a targeted and efficient manner.

(19) New Zealand made a series of recommendations to the CEP noting that these did not constitute a significant departure from the way the CEP currently works, but did include modifications in order to make the CEP more dynamic and responsive to key environmental risks.

(20) Brazil considered that WP 24 proposed interesting mechanisms which could help the Committee to deal with the priority issues defined in the five-year work plan. However, some of the proposals may need further consideration, possibly through intersessional discussions.

(21) Australia supported the concept of taking a more strategic approach to the CEP's work as outlined in the paper and endorsed a number of recommendations contained in the paper, including:

- the need to adopt the five-year work plan and use it to set the CEP's agenda;
- encouraging increased engagement from Parties, Observers and experts in intersessional work;
- seeking dedicated support from the Secretariat for project work; and
- changing the structure of the CEP report to make its advice to the ATCM explicit.

(22) The UK also emphasised the importance of taking a more strategic approach to the CEP's work noting that it could take decisions to drop certain items and take a proactive approach to deciding on the advice required by the ATCM.

(23) With no further comments the Chair noted that WP 24 would be further considered under Agenda item 9b.

(24) The CEP Chair introduced WP 29 rev.1 *A Five-Year Work plan for the CEP: Report on Intersessional Review* (New Zealand). The Chair reminded the Committee that a draft five-year work plan, which was endorsed on a provisional basis by CEP X, had been made available on the CEP Discussion Forum to provide an opportunity for all Members to comment further on it during the intersessional period. The Chair noted that the comments received had been included in the current version of the work plan appended to the paper.

(25) The CEP Chair noted that of the comments received during the intersessional period, Members had indicated their support for taking a more strategic or prioritised approach to the work of the Committee. Several Members also stressed the need to retain flexibility within the work plan; the need to ensure that Members have the opportunity to raise additional subjects at meetings of the Committee at any time, and the requirement to regularly review the work plan to make sure it remains relevant and up-to-date.

(26) In response both Brazil and the US noted that the mechanisms for working would need to depend on the issue in question and the resources available. The US suggested that even spending half a day at a CEP meeting on a particular topic may assist in making a leap of progress. Several Members also encouraged greater participation in intersessional activities and discussion groups to assist in taking matters forward.

(27) France, supported by Germany, noted that the use of the priority words “high”, “medium” and “low”, implied possible disregard by the Committee of issues given a “low” status. Instead France suggested the use of a numbered ranking system, with which the Committee agreed.

(28) The Chair recommended that the work plan be modified to include the numbered ranking system, and was considered again under Agenda item 8, when the Committee discussed the issue of non-native species, (Appendix 1, page 463). As this matter had received the highest rating in the work plan, it would be a useful “test case” to plan the CEP’s work on this issue over the next few years. At the Chair’s suggestion, the work plan was considered again when the Committee prepared its Agenda for CEP XII.

(29) The Committee adopted the five-year work plan contained in Appendix 1.

(30) Brazil introduced *WP 57 Report on Effectiveness of Trial Informal Group* summarising the lessons learned from operating the Trial Informal Group (TIG) established to review protected and managed area management plans. Brazil noted that the group worked via electronic means to review the management plans it was tasked with assessing. The TIG had developed a useful checklist which had greatly assisted the group in reviewing management plans in a comprehensive, systematic and clear manner. The group concluded that the whole process of evaluation, once internal operational procedures were established, was quite successful as:

- it provided useful advice in a focussed structured manner;
- participation had been better than in previous ICGs;
- the manner in which the group approached the review process seemed to facilitate the task considerably;
- responses by proponents had indicated that it greatly helped to improve management plans; and
- the development of the checklists was a useful tool for both the TIG and, possibly, by those preparing or revising management plans in the future.

(31) As a result the TIG recommended that:

- the CEP agree to formalise the Trial Informal Group (TIG) as a permanent standing group to review management plans (SGMP);
- the CEP encourage proponents to draw closely on the *Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas* as well as the checklist developed by the TIG, when preparing management plans;
- the CEP encourage proponents to include a summary cover sheet when presenting new or revised management plans;
- the CEP encourage greater participation by Members in the intersessional review of management plans; and
- if the TIG is established on an ongoing basis, proponents should be encouraged to resubmit modified plans that the TIG has revised, back to the TIG at least 60 days before the CEP meeting.

(32) Many Members commented on how the intersessional work helped countries in the elaboration and revision of management plans, noting the TIG had responded to its mandate in an effective manner.

(33) New Zealand asked whether the TIG had been able to identify opportunities to make management plans more effective. In response Brazil, supported by Australia, commented that the group had engaged in a wide-ranging discussion on matters such as this, but that they had been constrained by their Terms of Reference.

(34) Sweden noted that revision of management plans would be easier to evaluate if they were written in a formalised way. Sweden suggested that the text be harmonised. This work could be taken on by the SGMP.

(35) Australia commented that the TIG had operated as envisaged in its proposal put to CEP X in WP 10.

(36) Russia emphasised the importance of ensuring the efficacy of management plans and that the management measures remained relevant and effective. To this end it was important in establishing such a group on an ongoing basis to ensure its Terms of Reference were appropriate.

(37) Germany questioned what options might be available for the Members and the CEP to gauge the extent to which comments on the management plan had been incorporated by the proponent.

(38) It was noted that some proponents (though not all) had added a further column to the TIG's checklist to indicate how the comments had been addressed and what changes to the management plan had been made. Australia noted that this point lay behind the TIG's

recommendation that management plans revised on the basis of the TIG's advice should then be resubmitted to the TIG for a final review.

(39) Argentina, in supporting the establishment of such a group to assess management plans on an ongoing basis, indicated its desire to ensure that membership of such a group was open to all Members. Argentina also encouraged SCAR participation in the group noting the importance of having scientific advice on key elements of management plans.

(40) In response SCAR indicated that assisting with the review of management plans was a role it had withdrawn from in recent years responding to the CEP's wish to take on the review completely under its own remit, and ensuing changes in SCAR's organisation and the changes to the process by which it engaged with the CEP. Nevertheless, a recent meeting to review SCAR's support to the CEP had recommended that SCAR should engage with the review of management plans, as provided for by Article 6 of Annex V, and it may look to re-engage on assessing those elements of management plans that fell within SCAR's remit. The Committee welcomed SCAR's willingness to look at this issue.

(41) Japan questioned what benefits would be acquired from the formal establishment of such a management plan review group as opposed to continuing with the TIG.

(42) Australia responded noting that assessing new and revised management plans was an ongoing task for the Committee that currently required considerable time at its annual meetings. Establishing a permanent group to undertake this role would provide for consistency and continuity in ensuring that management plans were fit for purpose. It was also noted that a permanent group would also benefit from a consistent membership and an agreed convener.

(43) CEP Advice to the ATCM:

The Committee therefore agreed an outlined proposal for establishing a subsidiary group on management plans (included at Appendix 3, page 473). The Committee forwarded this proposal to the ATCM for approval in accordance with Rule 10 of the CEP's Rules of Procedure.

(44) Pending ATCM approval, the Committee welcomed Ewan McIvor (Australia) as the convenor of the group.

Item 4: Operation of the CEP

(45) The Secretariat briefly introduced SP 3 *Secretariat Report 2007/08*, commenting that the CEP website is now integrated into the ATS website and available in the four Treaty languages.

(46) Members thanked the Secretariat for this important work and noted the ease of use of the new website.

(47) The Secretariat introduced SP 12 *Electronic Exchange of Information System*, recalling that at CEP X the meeting had agreed to continue using the system on a trial basis during the intersessional period. During this period several Members submitted comments and suggestions on the system. The Secretariat had modified the system in response to all the suggestions received and concluded that the trial period could now be considered complete.

(48) Many Members agreed that it was a very useful system and agreed in principle that it should be used. Some noted that they had questions of a technical nature but these could be addressed in the future.

(49) The Committee noted that in accordance with Resolution 6 (2001) some Members met their Article 17 requirements by providing an online report via the Secretariat's website.

(50) The Chair proposed to the meeting that the system could now be used for complying with the requirements of annual environmental exchange of information under Article 17 of the Protocol, noted that the system will evolve to respond to opportunities to further improve the system. The Chair encouraged Members to begin to use the system and will recommend to the ATCM that the system be utilized as a reporting tool for the CEP.

(51) CEP Advice to the ATCM:

The CEP proposes that the Electronic Information Exchange System be utilised as a reporting tool to exchange information required under Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty.

(52) The following papers submitted to meet the reporting requirements under Article 17 of the Protocol, were also submitted under this agenda item:

- IP 14 *Rapport annuel présenté par la France conformément à l'article 17 du Protocole au Traité sur l'Antarctique relatif à la protection de l'environnement 2008* (France)
- IP 15 *Informe Anual del Ecuador de acuerdo con el Artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre Protección del Medio Ambiente* (Ecuador)
- IP 22 *Annual Report Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (Ukraine)
- IP 24 *Annual Report Pursuant to the Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (Japan)
- IP 25 *Informe Anual de España de acuerdo con el Artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre Protección del Medio Ambiente* (Spain)
- IP 34 *Informe Anual de Acuerdo al Artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre la Protección del Medio Ambiente Periodo 2007 – 2008* (Uruguay)
- IP 36 *Annual Report pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (Belgium)

- IP 42 *Annual Report pursuant to Article 17 of The Protocol on Environmental Protection to The Antarctic Treaty* (South Africa)
- IP 55 *Report on the Implementation of the Protocol on Environmental Protection as Required by Article 17 of the Protocol* (United Kingdom)
- IP 68 *Annual Report of China Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (China)
- IP 71 *Annual Report Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty 2007-2008* (Italy)
- IP 90 *Annual Report of New Zealand pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty 2007/2008* (New Zealand)
- IP 96 *Annual Report pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (Peru)

Item 5: International Polar Year

(53) SCAR Introduced IP 59 *International Polar Year 2007-2008 Planning Document: 2008 and Beyond*, stressing that IPY seemed poised to achieve and even exceed its ambitious goals. SCAR noted that IPY will make major advances in polar knowledge and understanding. SCAR also commented that whilst most legacies will take longer to develop, important outcomes and networks are, nevertheless, under development and, with time and continued international co-ordination, they will achieve an exceptional level of interest and participation.

(54) Dr Colin Summerhayes, on behalf of the IPY Steering Committee, noted the significant investment made to date in IPY science and called for sustainable funding to support the IPY legacy. In particular, funding in support of data management, informing the public and leaving a scientific legacy were still needed. Proper data management from IPY activities would be key to the legacy and would require national data co-ordinators who would provide secure data archives.

(55) SCAR noted that the Arctic Council had been asked to support a scoping study on IPY legacy issues and a workshop of stakeholders in IPY legacy topics. The idea to include Antarctic legacy issues into the workshop had been proposed so that it would be bi-polar in character.

(56) ASOC noted its work with the Association of Polar Early Career Scientists (APECS) in preparation for a Polar Youth Forum organised for the time of the 2009 ATCM in the United States, in the context of its IPY endorsed Environmental Legacy Project.

(57) The Committee encouraged Members to consider how further funding might be found in support of IPY legacy events and activities.

(58) Brazil presented IP 125 on the *South American Network on Antarctic Marine Biodiversity (BioMAntar)*, which involves seven South American countries: Argentina,

Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Peru, Uruguay and Venezuela. It was emphasised that these countries are making an effort to optimise logistics and undertake joint scientific activities in the Antarctic region. Brazil advised the Meeting that one good example of this increasing cooperation is the Latin American consortium for the Census of Antarctic Marine Life (LA CAML). Discussions involving scientists and administrators of these Latin American Programmes had been undertaken during the past three years to identify common scientific interests, research interfaces, sampling protocols, data exchange, and education and outreach activities. It was also noted that the countries are planning joint field work activities for the next austral summer.

(59) Australia commented that this consortium represented an excellent example of Antarctic cooperation and a lasting legacy of IPY.

Item 6: Environmental Impact Assessment

6a) Consideration of draft CEEs forwarded to the CEP in accordance with paragraph 4 of Article 3 of the Protocol

(60) China introduced WP 5 *The Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation for the construction and operation of the Chinese Dome A Station in Antarctica* and IP 4, with the same title, containing the complete draft CEE document. China supplemented its introduction of WP 5 with a powerpoint presentation summarising the proposed activity and the key findings of the draft CEE.

(61) China noted that the draft CEE had been circulated on 31 January 2008, 120 days before CEP XI, in accordance with the requirements of Annex I to the Protocol.

(62) The new Chinese Station is proposed to be located in the hinterland of East Antarctica at the summit in the central part of Dome A ice sheet with an elevation of 4093m (80°22'00.3 S; 77°21'11.3 E). The new Station will be located 1228km from Zhongshan Station. The draft CEE, prepared by the Chinese Arctic and Antarctic Administration (CAA) of the State Oceanic Administration (SOA), assessed the impacts arising from the transportation process for cargo and personnel to Dome A, the construction of the station and its ongoing operations.

(63) The location of the station had been selected because it is:

- an ideal site for the study of global climatic and environmental change;
- one of the most suitable sites for obtaining deep ice cores providing a record exceeding one million years; and
- a favourable site for monitoring and detecting global background atmospheric baseline environments; and a suitable site for astronomical observations and ozone monitoring.

(64) The construction of Dome A Station is planned to commence in 2008/09 and be completed in two austral summers, by the 2009/10 season. The station has a design life of 25 years. In the short term it will accommodate 15-20 people for summer only, and in the long term it will be used by 25 people as a year-round station. China noted that the design of the station followed the principles of environmental protection, safety and energy conservation, and that the environmental impact will be minimised during its construction, operation and decommissioning phases.

(65) China noted that the draft CEE had continued to be developed since its circulation to the Parties and to the Committee and particular attention had been paid to issues related to safety of expedition members, energy saving initiatives, scientific study and logistical support activities.

(66) China reaffirmed that the design of the Dome A Station was scientific, rational and technically practicable. China's draft CEE had concluded that the construction and operation of the Station would have no more than minor or transitory impacts on the environment. Moreover, the implementation of the prevention and mitigation measures outlined in the draft CEE would further reduce identified impacts. China considered that the scientific benefits of constructing the station outweighed the identified environmental impacts.

(67) Australia introduced WP 15 *Report of the Intersessional Open-ended Contact Group to Consider the draft CEE for the "Proposed Construction and Operation of the New Chinese Research Station at Dome A"*. Australia recalled that the intersessional contact group had been established in accordance with the *Procedures for consideration of draft CEEs* (Appendix 4 to the Final Report of CEP X) from which its terms of reference had been drawn. Australia noted that ten Members and one observer had participated in the intersessional discussions.

(68) Australia stated that the ICG had determined that the draft CEE generally conformed to the requirements of Article 3 of Annex I of the Environmental Protocol, but that several participants identified a number of matters for which they considered further information or clarification should be provided in the final CEE. In particular, many participants suggested the proponent should consider expanding the scope of the impact assessment to more adequately cover the proposed activities as described. In this respect, it was felt that more attention should be given in the final CEE to:

- the planned transition to a year-round station and the impacts associated with operating a year-round base;
- the research activities to be undertaken at the station, in particular ice core drilling;
- the movement of personnel and equipment through the Larsemann Hills ASMA; and
- the possible use of aircraft at and around the station.

(69) Several ICG participants also suggested the final CEE should provide more details about planned waste management measures, including the handling of human waste during construction and operational phases, the management of ice pits, and the storage and handling of hazardous waste, and plans for fuel handling and storage.

(70) Australia also commented that the ICG had worked well, particularly as a first test for the new procedure adopted at CEP X, and thanked ICG participants for their contribution.

(71) Several ICG participants agreed with the proponent's conclusion that the proposed activity is justified on the basis of the significant contribution it is likely to make to the support and conduct of important science. However, some participants expressed the view that, for a range of reasons identified in the analysis of the draft CEE, it would be more appropriate to conclude that the activity is likely to have more than a minor or transitory impact on the Antarctic environment. A range of editorial suggestions were also put forward by the ICG.

(72) China thanked the CEP Members and, in particular Mr Ewan McIvor for his effective work in coordinating the ICG. China noted that IP 77 *Additional Information on draft CEE on proposed new Chinese Dome A Station in Antarctica*, provided its initial response to each of the points raised by the ICG and that the comments and suggestions received would be taken into account in preparing the final CEE.

(73) Members thanked China for presenting its detailed responses in the form of IP 77. This approach was regarded as a useful model to follow for future draft CEEs.

(74) Ukraine questioned how waste would be handled, noting, for example, that the draft CEE did not estimate quantities of human waste expected to be removed from the station.

(75) China responded that waste management, including quantities, was already addressed in the draft CEE, and additional information will be included in the final CEE.

(76) The Russian Federation congratulated China on its ambitious and pioneering proposal, but recognised the unique difficulties that inland stations presented. Russia commented on the reported power requirements for the new station which were, in its view, insufficient especially when scientific drilling is undertaken. Russia, supported by France, also requested further information on the planned air activities, noting that this would add an increased environmental impact.

(77) Germany expressed a wish to see fuller consideration given to the likely impacts on the Larsemann Hills Antarctic Specially Managed Area, and questioned the time that will be spent transiting through the Larsemann Hills ASMA each season.

(78) New Zealand added that they would like to see more consideration given to cumulative impacts in the document and also to the likely impact on wilderness values. New Zealand noted that consideration of wilderness values more generally was an issue that the Committee may wish to give further attention to.

(79) In response China noted that mitigation measures to reduce impacts on the Larsemann Hills ASMA were contained in the draft CEE. Approximately 10 days would be spent transiting through the ASMA each season. The provisions of the Larsemann Hills ASMA would be fully adhered to. Regarding the planned scientific drilling, China noted that this activity is not envisioned until 2011 and a further environmental impact assessment will be prepared for that specific activity.

(80) With regard to power requirements, China indicated that it would give further consideration to the matter and would provide more details in the final CEE. Regarding air operations, as mentioned in the draft CEE, aircraft will be used for emergency rescue and science support. The plane was likely to be a fixed-wing, ski-equipped aircraft, which would conduct about three rotations to Dome A each season. Fuel for air operations will be stored at a relay site between Dome A and Zhong Shan station. China noted that it would be keen to draw on the experience of those already operating aircraft in inland Antarctica, in planning for these activities.

(81) France noted that the project will contribute to fundamental scientific knowledge and offered to share its experience gained from the French / Italian Concordia Station and noted that a Chinese delegation had been invited to visit this station in the near future. France also commented on the need to minimise duplication of scientific research.

(82) China thanked France and Italy for the invitation to visit Concordia Station and noted that the new Chinese station will adopt an open policy as a science base for other countries in the spirit of the Antarctic Treaty. China responded that before making the plan for constructing the new Dome A Station, it had held some international workshops on the feasibility study on the setting up of the new station to avoid the duplication of scientific activities undertaken by other National Programmes. China noted that it will take the environmental impacts from the scientific programme, including the wilderness values, into account in the final CEE.

(83) The UK thanked China for the draft CEE and the additional information provided in IP 77 which answered many of the questions posed by the ICG, in which the UK had participated. The UK noted the scope of the proposed science programme and agreed with New Zealand on the need for greater consideration of cumulative impact.

(84) Many Members welcomed the scientific benefits that would arise from the new station. Romania also welcomed China's efforts to learn from the experience of other operators, and encouraged China to make use of modern technology to reduce emissions and other impacts on the environment.

(85) China indicated that it is always willing to enhance collaboration and communication with other Parties and also pointed out that as part of its preparation for constructing Dome A Station Chinese professionals and experts had visited the inland stations and obtained significant experience and information.

(86) India congratulated China on the presentation of the draft CEE and pointed out that the impact on the environment appeared to be underestimated. It hoped that the final CEE would incorporate the suggestions given by delegations.

(87) The US noted that for China to ensure that the cumulative impacts of the activities associated with the construction and operation of the new station were fully taken into account it should also take into account the potential impacts of planned scientific activities. The US also commented that the current draft CEE would most likely not account for all activities during the life time of the station and that separate EIAs would be appropriate for unforeseen or as yet unplanned activities.

(88) Norway noted that in the past ice core drilling projects had been subject to CEE level assessment in their own right and queried in that context whether it would be appropriate to do a separate assessment for the scientific activity taken rather than now including it in the final CEE for the Dome A Station.

(89) The Netherlands encouraged China to account for drilling fluids remaining in ice core drill holes in the final CEE.

(90) ASOC commented that every new Antarctic station has a cumulative environmental impact. Construction of the new Chinese station would have impacts on both the wilderness of the high plateau region as well as impacts on the Larsemann Hills ASMA through the logistic support activities of the station. ASOC therefore asked China whether this station will be removed after a certain time and what that time period might be.

(91) China responded that cumulative impacts of the activities would be considered in the final CEE. Regarding the dismantlement of the station, and noting that the station has a design life of 25 years, China noted it would give consideration to the removal of the buildings. China also welcomed the additional comments and noted that it would take these into account in preparing the final version of the CEE. China would also be open to considering further comments on the CEE as it is being finalised and when it is circulated in accordance with Annex I to the Protocol.

(92) China commented that the draft CEE's conclusion raised two issues: whether a CEE should conclude that the activity was likely to have more than a minor or transitory impact; and whether the conclusion of its draft CEE was adequately supported by the information contained in the document. On the first issue, China considered that a CEE could reach one of two conclusions according to Article 3 of Annex I to the Protocol.

(93) China noted that, in general, a CEE would conclude that the activity was likely to have more than a minor or transitory impact. However, compared with other stations recently or soon to be built in Antarctica, the proposed Dome A station was small in scale. A smaller labour force would be involved in its construction and few personnel would stay at the station during its operation. Furthermore, the duration of its operation would be short (only two months each year), including the travel time, for about half of its life span. China noted

that it was available to undertake a further environmental evaluation based on the discussion and the full improvement of the whole plan.

(94) The Chair thanked China for its willingness to consider all of the points raised.

(95) CEP Advice to the ATCM:

The Committee discussed in detail the draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) prepared by China for “Proposed Construction and Operation of the new Chinese Dome A Station, Dome A, Antarctica” (WP 5 and IP 4). It also discussed the comprehensive report by Australia of the ICG established to consider the draft CEE in accordance with the Procedures for intersessional CEP consideration of draft CEEs (WP 15), and additional information provided by China in response to issues raised in the ICG (IP 77). Those discussions are summarised in paragraphs 60-93 above.

Having fully considered the draft CEE, the Committee advises ATCM XXXI that:

- The draft CEE and the process followed by China generally conform to the requirements of Article 3 of Annex I to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty. When preparing the required final CEE, the proponent should closely consider, and address as appropriate, the comments raised by Members. In particular, the ATCM’s attention is drawn to the suggestion that China should consider expanding the scope of the impact assessment in the final CEE to more adequately cover the full scope of the proposed activity (Section 3.1 of WP 15 and paragraphs 68-89 above).
- The Committee generally agreed with China’s conclusion that the proposed activity is justified on the basis of the significant contribution it is likely to make to the support and conduct of important science. Many Members expressed the view that it would be more appropriate for the CEE to conclude that the activity is likely to have more than a minor or transitory impact on the Antarctic environment (Section 3.2 of WP 15).
- The draft CEE is clear and well-structured, and the final CEE could be improved by taking into consideration editorial suggestions raised by ICG participants (Appendix B to WP 15) and by consolidating text to reduce repetition.

General discussion on draft CEEs

(96) Many Members commented on the conclusions that may be drawn by CEEs. Some Members agreed that a CEE could legitimately conclude that the activity in question would have *no more than* a minor or transitory impact, whilst other Members felt that a CEE should inherently conclude that the activity *will have more than* a minor or transitory impact.

(97) Norway noted that the breadth of activities associated with the station previously discussed, in addition to the station itself, justified a conclusion that the impacts will be

more than minor or transitory. Norway noted, however, that a “no more than minor or transitory” conclusion can be reached through a CEE process.

(98) Argentina reminded the Committee that the CEP had discussed this issue before. EIA is a process as represented in *Guidelines for Environmental Impact Assessment in Antarctica* adopted through Resolution 4 (2005). At the time of the preparation of the Guide, it had been concluded that a CEE document will only be prepared on a proposed project which is deemed likely to have more than a minor or transitory impact.

(99) Australia noted that Article 3 of Annex I states “*If an Initial Environmental Evaluation indicates or if it is otherwise determined that a proposed activity is likely to have more than a minor or transitory impact, a Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation shall be prepared*”. The Protocol does not prescribe what the conclusion of the CEE should be, only that a draft CEE must be circulated. As such, the final conclusion should be determined by the impacts identified by the environmental impact assessment process and the extent of mitigation measures. As such Australia believed it is entirely possible that some CEEs could indeed conclude that an activity will not have more than a minor or transitory impact.

(100) France concurred that Article 3 of Annex 1 does not pre-judge the conclusion of a CEE, and that the conclusion of a CEE is not necessarily of fundamental importance. What is important is that a CEE level assessment allows for a detailed analysis of the impacts of an activity and a process of review by the Members and discussion during the CEP meeting.

(101) Spain noted its agreement with Argentina stating that, according to Article 2, Annex I to the Protocol the step up to a CEE from an IEE would be undertaken if the IEE result shows that the level of impact could be more than minor or transitory.

(102) The Czech Republic noted that because the terms “minor or transitory” in the Protocol are not defined, such ambiguity was always likely to remain.

(103) The Chair noted that different views on the conclusions of CEEs clearly remained and that it was unlikely that a consensus view could be reached. Nevertheless, the discussion had been useful, would allow Members to reflect on the points made and could be returned to at future meetings.

(104) Argentina and France welcomed the translation of the non-technical summary of the Chinese draft CEE in to the four Treaty languages, which had assisted intersessional review of the document. Argentina felt that translation of draft CEEs in their entirety, given the technical level of the language used, would be preferable.

(105) The Chair noted that this matter had been raised with the ATCM last year, and that the ATCM had neither agreed nor disagreed with the proposal. The ATCM had simply noted that the budgetary consequences would need to be taken into account. The Secretariat noted that the matter was a financial one as there was currently no Secretariat budget line to provide for translation of draft CEEs.

(106) The Chair noted that an interim solution was to continue to at least provide translations of the non-technical summaries of each draft CEE.

6b) Other EIA matters

(107) SCAR introduced WP 12 *Human Disturbance to Wildlife in the Broader Antarctic Region: A Review of Findings*, provided in response to a request from CEP X to report on the current state of knowledge with respect to human disturbance of wildlife in Antarctica. WP 12 included a comprehensive review paper, entitled: *Review of recent research into the effects of human disturbance on wildlife in the Antarctic and sub-Antarctic region*.

(108) SCAR drew attention to the Working Paper's two major conclusions and three recommendations. Specifically, SCAR noted that the effects of human disturbance on Antarctic wildlife are highly variable and that no 'one size fits all' solution can be applied to managing human disturbance effects on wildlife. SCAR also noted with concern the decline in the number of long-term studies being undertaken and recommended that Parties encourage long-term work that would help improve management of wildlife populations in the region.

(109) SCAR also suggested that site-specific, timing-specific and species-specific studies are required to produce results of use in managing human activities near wildlife aggregations, and that investigations of interactions between human disturbance and other factors affecting wildlife populations, such as climate change and incidental mortality, are urgently required.

(110) The Committee endorsed these recommendations and congratulated SCAR on its excellent report. Many delegations noted the importance of undertaking long-term research, especially in the context of other factors affecting wildlife populations in the region, and that SCAR's report would be invaluable for ongoing discussions on this topic.

(111) In welcoming SCAR's paper, New Zealand noted that the CEP was not endorsing a "one size fits all" approach distance, and suggested that a further review of this matter was required by the CEP.

(112) Australia noted that it placed a high level of importance on providing appropriate guidance and education to its expeditioners and that its current approach distances accounted for different species and stages in their life cycles as well as other factors.

(113) Argentina noted the need to have educational material regarding behaviour around wildlife.

(114) IAATO noted the importance of education in mitigating human disturbance and stated that in its view the current 5 metre rule was regarded as the basic minimum distance; tourists were warned to stay further away if disturbance was perceived to be occurring.

(115) The US, supported by the UK, emphasised SCAR's comment with respect to conducting long-term studies in the context of other influences and noted that this was in

part addressed through CCAMLR's ecosystem monitoring programme, from which the CEP could also benefit. The US noted that the idea of a joint CEP / Scientific Committee workshop was proposed and that discussion of such monitoring studies could form a useful part of that meeting.

(116) The UK urged the need for more studies to better inform management decisions regarding wildlife distances and urged caution against drawing general or generic conclusions from one or two specific case studies. The UK also noted that it would be continuing with its long-term penguin monitoring studies at Port Lockroy and would ensure the data and results were made available in due course.

(117) COMNAP noted that it was preparing an on-line library of current training materials available through national programmes.

(118) The Committee welcomed this initiative noting that it would be a useful means of sharing information and educational material with respect to current approach distances.

(119) France introduced WP 34, *A Mechanism for Centralizing Tourism and Non-governmental Activity Declarations and Authorization Requests Suitable for Taking Cumulative Impacts into Account*. It noted that, although the impact of a single activity in a given site can be assessed as less than minor or transitory, it had become difficult to estimate the cumulative impact of the overall activity resulting from visits of several operators to a given site. France recalled that, according to the Protocol, tourist activity was subjected to a prior environmental impact assessment and that it had to be done based on sufficient information. It also mentioned that several recommendations adopted recently by the ATCM were directly or indirectly related to the cumulative impacts of tourist activity in the Antarctic.

(120) France proposed to establish a mechanism for centralising tourism and non-governmental activity authorisation to allow national competent authorities to be aware of the information and their status, in real time, before October 1st (the deadline for exchanging pre-season information) to better consider the possible cumulative environmental impacts at a given site. France suggested that an ICG should be established to work in close cooperation with the Secretariat to consider such a procedure.

(121) The Committee agreed on the importance of new initiatives to help develop a better understanding of cumulative impacts.

(122) Several Members indicated that they could support France's proposal in principle, but highlighted practical concerns with its implementation bearing in mind significant differences in the way authorising agencies in various countries operated, and the need to avoid duplication of effort between such a centralised system and Parties' own requirements.

(123) Spain stated that in order to avoid a situation whereby individuals were able to elude their own national legislation, those organising non-governmental expeditions should seek authorisation from their own national authorities, according to the provisions of Annex I to the Protocol, Measure 4 (2004) and Resolution 4 (2004).

(124) Several Members and COMNAP noted the importance of having data available on tourism activities, particularly with landings close to stations and bases.

(125) The US suggested the need to have reference to existing data on use of visitor sites.

(126) Argentina noted that relevant information, particularly IEEs on tourism activities, was not always publicly available. Access to such information would be valuable to adequately assess cumulative impacts.

(127) Australia noted that cumulative impact was a vexing issue that the Committee had considered over many years, and that further work was scheduled in the five-year work plan. It considered there may be challenges with France's proposal, and that it may be better to separate consideration of the proposed mechanism from further work to understand cumulative impacts.

(128) IAATO thanked France for WP 34 and the useful discussion. IAATO had some concerns with the assumption that cumulative impacts could be linked only to numbers of visits and/or visitors, noting that consideration had been given to the complexity of issues surrounding assessment of cumulative impacts for many years. That said, IAATO supported the concept of a single database of information on all visitor activities as good cooperation and coordination is integral to successful management.

(129) IAATO also noted that in addition to the current distribution of detailed information on Member activities prior to the season to COMNAP and other Parties, they would be pleased to pass this information on to other National Authorities if this would be of use. In addition, following a comment from New Zealand on the important role of guides, IAATO noted that field staff are of key importance in the current mechanism of identifying and assessing potential impacts thus allowing for immediate action to be taken.

(130) Argentina questioned IAATO as to whether there is a post-season evaluation of the differences between planned and actual activities.

(131) IAATO said that estimates from field staff indicate a 10 – 15% change from the pre-season planning.

(132) IUCN urged that a comprehensive review of Antarctic tourism be undertaken so as to better inform appropriate management measures.

(133) New Zealand raised the idea of a detailed study at a highly visited tourist site to gather hard data to help inform the process of assessing cumulative impacts.

(134) CEP Advice to the ATCM:

The Committee discussed the proposals set out in WP 34. Whilst several Members expressed in-principle support, a number of concerns were raised regarding the practical implementation of the proposed database. The Committee reinforced the importance of adequately assessing cumulative impacts at regularly visited sites, but noted the challenges

involved in gathering appropriate information and data. Noting that WP 34 would be considered also by the ATCM through its Tourism Working Group, the Committee agreed that it would await the outcomes of that discussion before assessing how it might contribute further to the issue.

(135) The United Kingdom introduced WP 60 *Quantifying Atmospheric Emissions in Antarctic Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations* reporting on an analysis of the emissions estimated in final CEEs prepared since 1989. The UK noted the wide variety of chemical species reported on, and the range of different methodologies used in the final CEE produced since the Environment Protocol entered into force.

(136) To assist Parties compiling final CEEs, the UK proposed to develop a common approach to emission reporting in CEEs based on existing agreed international standards. If the CEP considered that this might be a useful approach, the UK indicated that it would be willing to prepare a more detailed paper, in conjunction with interested Parties, for consideration at CEP XII.

(137) Many Members and ASOC indicated their support for the UK, recognising the benefits of being able to have a consistent approach to calculating emissions, not least when preparing CEEs.

(138) China commented that whilst this appeared to be a useful proposal it may not be a priority matter for the Committee. China also expressed concern that the CEP should not be duplicating efforts of other organisations, particularly with respect to CO₂, which was not considered to be a pollutant by some countries.

(139) Germany and the US expressed caution over attempting to set standards for calculating emissions, with many countries bound by their own domestic standards.

(140) In supporting the proposal Russia noted the EU standards on transboundary transfer of pollutants may be a useful reference.

(141) COMNAP offered assistance to the UK of its Energy Management Network which had embarked on drafting proposals for indicators of energy consumption, noting that whilst the level of Antarctic CO₂ emissions were insignificant compared to global emissions, the world was watching Antarctica and it was therefore important to take an appropriate leadership and educational role in the Antarctic context.

(142) In responding the UK welcomed the feedback provided, noting that it was not intended that any common approach would supersede national requirements or other accepted standards. It also recalled that its proposal was to identify a common approach to calculating emissions in CEEs for activities undertaken in Antarctica. The UK also agreed with COMNAP that whilst the contribution of Antarctic emissions to global emissions was negligible, there was an opportunity for Antarctica to set an example to the rest of the world.

(143) The Committee encouraged the UK and other interested Parties to further develop the proposal for consideration at CEP XII.

(144) The Secretariat introduced SP 8 covering the *Annual list of Initial Environmental Evaluations (IEE) and Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEE) prepared between April 1st 2007 and March 31st 2008*, noting that information had been received on more than 80 EIAs from 15 Parties. The Secretariat also noted that the web based EIA database now contained entries on 677 EIAs, many of which also include the actual EIA document in electronic format.

(145) Romania introduced IP 1 *Initial Environmental Evaluation Law-Racovita Base*, on the assessment of impacts associated with scientific and logistic activities at Law-Racovita Base, Larsemann Hills, during the Romanian Antarctic Expedition 2008/09. The adverse impacts on the environment will be minor.

(146) India introduced IP 16 *Update on the Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation of New Indian Research Base at Larsemann Hills, Antarctica*. India informed the Meeting that a preliminary design of the station was prepared and that, during the 2007/08 season, further studies were carried out in Larsemann Hills. Construction of the station will start in summer 2009/10 and it will be commissioned in 2010/11.

(147) Belgium requested clarification on the timing of the circulation of India's final CEE, and expressed its concern over potential impacts on the lakes in the area, in particular lake 7, in which unique species and a rich biodiversity had recently been identified.

(148) India confirmed that the final CEE would be circulated at least sixty days before the commencement of the activities in accordance with the requirements of Annex I to the Protocol. India also stated that it was well aware of the research that had been conducted on lakes in the area, and that lake 7 would not be interfered with.

(149) India introduced IP 26 *Initial Environmental Evaluation for Installation of Earth Station at Maitri, Schirmacher Oasis, Antarctica*, noting that the objective of the activity was to provide better communication and real time data transfer facility between Antarctica and mainland India. Once operational it will help in enhancing the capabilities and efficacies of Indian polar orbiting satellites. The IEE had concluded that the adverse impacts on the environment at the site were no more than minor or transitory.

(150) India also presented IP 49 *Initial Environmental Evaluation for Installation of Wind Energy Generators (WEG) at Maitri, Schirmacher Oasis, Antarctica*, informing the meeting that the long-term data collected on wind speed indicated the potential of harnessing wind energy to convert into electrical energy. The installation of the WEG is planned in the winter of 2008/09 and India concluded that the gains through electricity generation by wind will reduce the sustained impact on the environment. India had concluded that an IEE was sufficient to address the impacts of the activity.

(151) ASOC introduced issues concerning EIA and tourism addressed in IP 41 *A decade of Antarctic tourism: Status, change and actions needed*. ASOC considered that tourism EIAs hitherto had been Initial Environmental Evaluations or Preliminary Assessments, which often did not go into adequate detail about what is actually proposed, and insufficiently

address cumulative impact. EIAs for tourism operations tended to focus on routine activities, without taking into consideration the potential impact of accidents. The EIAs of the largest ship to sail in Antarctica ever, in 2006-07, which carried nearly 3,000 passengers, and of the *M/V Explorer*, which sank in Antarctic waters in November 2007, were used as examples. ASOC recommended CEP look critically at the application of EIA to tourism. EIAs could be conducted for sites for which site-specific guidelines are in place, which are among those under higher tourism pressure, to better assess cumulative impacts.

(152) The US strongly disagreed with ASOC's overarching criticism of the EIA process for tourism activities, particularly with regard to multi-year assessments, and with ASOC's conclusions regarding the level of assessment for the 3000 passenger ship activities.

(153) Russia introduced IP 44 *Results of Russian studies of the subglacial Lake Vostok during the season 2007-2008*. Russia recalled a number of incidents that had occurred in borehole 5G-1 during 2007 that had delayed progress with further drilling of the ice core and penetration of the sub-glacial Lake Vostok. Further attempts would be made towards recovery of the trapped drill, though if this was not successful Russia plans to abandon the area where the drill is trapped and instead drill around the accident area.

(154) As a result of these technical delays, and a delay in collecting further data and information on ice characteristics near the ice sheet bottom, Russia noted that it had not been possible to complete the final CEE for penetration of Lake Vostok. However, Russia stated that it would present the final version of the CEE as soon as electrical-mechanical drilling is stopped close to the lake surface and before commencing with thermal drilling for lake penetration.

(155) Russia also presented IP 45 *On obtainment of permit to authorize activities of the Russian Antarctic Expedition for the period from 2008 to 2012*, on the authorisation process of the Russian Antarctic Expedition for next the 5-year period. Russia said that an IEE was prepared and it indicated that all the considered activities being carried out now and planned to be carried out during the next 5-year period, would have no more than a minor or transitory impact on the Antarctic environment.

(156) New Zealand introduced IP 101 *The ANDRILL Independent Environmental Audit* recalling that the ANDRILL CEE had provided for an independent audit to be undertaken. Such an audit was conducted by the British Antarctic Survey and the Australian Antarctic Division on the ANDRILL McMurdo Sound Portfolio project in November 2007 on the invitation of Antarctica New Zealand.

(157) The audit had concluded that the programme was undertaken in compliance with the Protocol and largely in accordance with the CEE, and that the impacts were believed to be within the environmental limits established in the CEE. The audit provided several recommendations for the ANDRILL partners to consider. New Zealand concluded that such an external audit could be considered a satisfactory way of achieving the requirements of Resolution 2 (1997), and encouraged other Members to provide for such audits for activities carried out under CEEs.

(158) Australia and the UK thanked New Zealand for the opportunity to carry out the audit and supported the recommendation that Parties use independent audits to assess the findings of CEE level activities, whenever possible.

(159) Ukraine presented IP 102 *On the Issue of the Replacement of Fuel Tanks at Vernadsky Station*, informing the meeting of the progress made in installing new fuel tanks at Vernadsky station. Ukraine also noted that half of one of the old tanks had now been cleared of oil product deposits. It is planned to finish clearing both of the old tanks and to use them as a storage facility for dry solid materials.

(160) Ukraine also introduced IP 124 *Initial Environmental Evaluation “RMM-technology on recycling of solid food wastes at Ukrainian Antarctic Vernadsky station”* on the development and usage of a new technology on recycling of solid food wastes to conform to Article 1(2) of Annex III of Environment Protocol.

(161) Ecuador presented IP 105 *Plan de Manejo Ambiental Estación Maldonado Ecuador* on an environmental management programme at Maldonado Station which included a number of activities such as prevention of environmental impacts, contingency planning, recovering of affected zones, training, monitoring and measures to protect wildlife.

Item 7: Area Protection and Management

7a) Management plans

i. Draft management plans which had been reviewed by the trial informal group

(162) The Committee considered four draft management plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas and one draft management plan for an Antarctic Specially Managed Area which had been reviewed intersessionally by the Trial Informal Group (TIG) established at CEP X.

(163) As convenor of the TIG, Brazil presented WP 58 *Review of Draft Management Plans by Trial Informal Group*. Brazil recalled that the TIG had developed a checklist for assessing protected and managed area management plans and informed the Meeting that this had greatly assisted their work. Brazil noted that the draft conclusions of the TIG were made available at the CEP Discussion Forum in the four Treaty languages and feedback was received by several Members and observers.

(164) The TIG had reviewed one ASMA and four ASPA Management Plans in accordance with the terms of reference set by CEP X.

(165) *Draft Management Plan for ASMA No X: South-west Anvers Island and Palmer Basin* – was presented under WP 39 (United States).

(166) The TIG considered that the draft Management Plan was well written and that it adequately addressed the provisions of Annex V and relevant CEP guidelines. The TIG noted that the CCAMLR Scientific Committee had reviewed the draft Management Plan

and had supported the proposal, noting that some minor changes would be required. The TIG recommended only minor amendments to this Management Plan, and the United States submitted a revised draft adequately addressing those recommendations. Separate to the TIG, comments on the draft Management Plan were submitted by ASOC.

(167) The TIG therefore recommended that the CEP adopt the Management Plan for the proposed South-west Anvers Island and Palmer Basin ASMA.

(168) *Draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) Management Plan for Amanda Bay, Ingrid Christensen Coast, Princess Elizabeth Land, East Antarctica* – was presented under WP 19 (Australia and China).

(169) The TIG considered that this draft Management Plan had been prepared to a high standard, and that it adequately addressed the provisions of Annex V and relevant CEP guidelines. The TIG recommended only minor amendments to this Management Plan, and Australia and China submitted a revised draft adequately addressing those recommendations. Separate to the TIG, no comments on the draft Management Plan were submitted by other Members.

(170) The TIG therefore recommended that the CEP adopt the Management Plan for the proposed Amanda Bay ASPA.

(171) *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 150 Ardley Island, Maxwell Bay, King George Island* – was presented under WP 46 rev. 1 (Chile).

(172) The TIG considered that Chile had made good progress with updating the Management Plan for Ardley Island, and that the draft revised Management Plan addressed the provisions of Annex V and relevant CEP guidelines. The TIG recommended only minor amendments to this Management Plan, and Chile submitted a revised draft adequately addressing those recommendations. Separate to the TIG, comments on the draft Management Plan were submitted by Germany and ASOC.

(173) The Trial Informal Group recommended that the CEP adopt the revised Management Plan for ASPA 150, Ardley Island.

(174) *Revised Draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area Management Plan for Mount Harding, Grove Mount, East Antarctic* – was presented under WP 52 (China).

(175) The TIG considered that the draft Management Plan should be modified to more closely comply with the provisions of Annex V and relevant CEP guidelines. The TIG recommended a number of changes to this Management Plan, and China submitted a revised draft adequately addressing those recommendations. Separate to the TIG, comments on the draft Management Plan were submitted by Australia. Australia indicated that the revised draft Management Plan adequately addressed those comments.

(176) The Trial Informal Group recommended that the CEP adopt the Management Plan for the proposed Mount Harding ASPA.

(177) *Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASP) Management Plan for Marion Nunataks, Charcot Island, Antarctic Peninsula* – presented under WP 53 (United Kingdom).

(178) The TIG considered that the draft Management Plan was well written and that it adequately addressed the provisions of Annex V and relevant CEP guidelines. The TIG recommended only minor amendments to this Management Plan, and the United Kingdom submitted a revised draft adequately addressing those recommendations. Separate to the TIG, no comments on the draft Management Plan were submitted by other Members.

(179) The Trial Informal Group recommended that the CEP adopt the Management Plan for the proposed Marion Nunataks ASPA.

(180) The Committee thanked the TIG, and its coordinator Tânia Brito in particular, for the valuable work done during the intersessional period in assessing these management plans and for the advice it had provided.

(181) With regard to the new draft management plans for South-west Anvers Island and Palmer Basin ASMA, and Marion Nunataks ASPA, the Committee agreed that these plans could be forwarded to the ATCM for adoption.

(182) Romania suggested that China consider including soil micro organisms in the ASPA Management Plan for Mount Harding.

(183) China stated that the primary consideration of the ASPA in Mount Harding is to protect the unique geomorphological features. The new finding of microbiological organisms in the cold desert soil in Mount Harding made by Romanian scientists is interesting, but needs further investigation. China would like to consider it in the future.

(184) With regard to the new draft Mount Harding Management Plan Japan asked for clarification with respect to prohibitions on bringing fauna and flora in to the protected area. With some minor changes to the text the Committee endorsed the Management Plan and forwarded it to the ATCM for adoption.

(185) With regard to the new draft Amanda Bay Management Plan, Japan asked for clarification with respect to the management of human waste in the area. Following clarification of this issue from Australia, the Committee agreed to forward the Management Plan to the ATCM for adoption.

(186) Regarding the revised Management Plan for ASPA 150, Ardley Island, Germany reminded the meeting that it was working towards the development of a future ASMA for Fildes Peninsula, which includes Ardley Island, and therefore it considered that the review of the ASPA Management Plan should be considered as part of the process for designating the ASMA in Fildes Peninsula. Besides, some comments from Germany made in the intersessional work were not properly reflected. Germany therefore noted that it could not approve the revised ASPA during the meeting and recalled that the existing Management Plan remains in force until 2010.

(187) Chile responded that it had not anticipated comments from Germany after the review process by the TIG. Chile noted that the current version of the Management Plan was adopted in 1991 and that this updated draft addressed the latest knowledge of the site and included new measures for improved protection. Several delegations supported the comments made by Chile.

(188) Some delegations asked Chile for more clarification on the change in the boundaries of the ASPA to allow tourism visits to some areas that now would be outside the boundaries of the protected area. ASOC noted that tourist activity associated with any ASPA could set a bad precedent for the Antarctic protected area system.

(189) In responding to these questions Chile noted that confusion had existed among the various activities occurring in the area. As a result a very well differentiated coastal zone was removed from the boundaries of the ASPA to provide a buffer zone so as to avoid impacts on the values of the area from tourism activity.

(190) As result of discussions, Chile agreed to continue discussing the future of Fildes Peninsula in the framework of an international working group (IWG) on Fildes, but making it clear that terms of reference for that group should recognise that Ardley Island is an existing ASPA designated and adopted by the ATCM.

(191) Germany agreed and noted that the terms of reference in the work plan for the future activities of the IWG agreed by this working group were distributed and would be made available on the IWG web-based discussion forum after the Meeting.

(192) The Committee agreed to send this Management Plan for further intersessional review.

ii. Draft revised management plans which had not been reviewed by the trial informal group

(193) The Committee considered revised management plans for the following Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) under this category:

- WP 7 *Five Years Review of Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No 161 Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea (Italy)*
- WP 8 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 138 Linnaeus Terrace, Asgard Range, Victoria Land (United States)*
- WP 9 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 137, North-west White Island, McMurdo Sound (United States)*
- WP 13 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 106 Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea (United States)*
- WP 14 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 124 Cape Crozier, Ross Island (United States)*
- WP 25 *Review of Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No 105, 118, 154, 155 and 156 (New Zealand)*

- WP 31 *Review of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) 135, 143, 160 (Australia)*
- WP 32 *Review of Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No 141 (Japan)*
- WP 37 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 123 Barwick and Balham Valleys, Southern Victoria Land (United States)*
- WP 47 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 125, Fildes Peninsula, King George Island (Isla 25 De Mayo) (Chile)*

(194) In introducing WP 7, Italy noted that there had been no substantial changes made to the provisions of the existing Management Plan. Italy noted that the changes related to the supporting bibliography, the new projects to be undertaken in the area, a small addition on the presence of cetacean species and new information regarding the Antarctic silver fish, *Pleurogramma antarcticum* around the Terra Nova Bay ASPA.

(195) Noting the minor changes to the Management Plan, the Committee agreed to forward it to the ATCM for adoption.

(196) In introducing its five revised ASPA management plans the United States noted that:

- No substantial changes had been made to the existing Management Plan of ASPA 138 (Linnaeus Terrace). The boundaries of the Area remained the same and only minor edits and corrections had been made to the description of the Area and plan policies.
- No substantial changes were made to the Management Plan of ASPA 123 (Barwick and Balham Valley). Changes in the Management Plan were limited to minor edits and corrections to the description of the area and plan policies.
- Some substantial changes had been introduced in the Management Plan of ASPA 137 (North-west White Island). These related to the extension of some boundaries, clarification and improvement of the aircraft access guidelines, and improvement of precautions against alien introductions.
- Substantial changes were also introduced to the Management Plan of ASPA 124 (Cape Crozier). These related to changes in the boundaries of the ASPA, changes in the values to be protected; the scientific activities permitted in the area; clarification in the aircraft access guidelines and more restrictions on aircraft activities in the area.
- Substantial modifications had been made to the Management Plan of ASPA 106 (Cape Hallett). These related to changes in the boundaries of the ASPA, the description of the values of the area, improvements in the description of the objectives of the ASPA, updating of maps, as well as additional controls on access to and movements within the Area. The somewhat novel approach proposed with the revised Management Plan was to include a flexible boundary that was defined by the extent of the penguin colony. The US noted that this

approach of using a biological feature to delineate the area was not entirely without precedent and was currently used for Beaufort Island, ASPA 105. Nevertheless, the US suggested that this Management Plan be sent for intersessional review.

(197) The Committee also endorsed the changes to the Management Plan for ASPA 124 (Cape Crozier) and agreed to forward this revised Management Plan to the ATCM for adoption.

(198) With respect to the revised management plans for ASPAs 123 (Barwick and Balham Valley), 137 (North-west White Island) and 138 (Linnaeus Terrace), Japan suggested minor changes to specific parts of the text. With these changes the Committee endorsed the management plans and agreed to forward them to the ATCM for adoption.

(199) With respect to the revised ASPA 106 (Cape Hallett) Management Plan, Japan indicated that imprecise boundaries such as those proposed, provided particular difficulties in adopting such plans in Japanese law. Japan welcomed the opportunity to discuss this matter further in the intersessional period.

(200) New Zealand presented WP 25 on the review of five ASPA management plans: ASPAs 105 (Beaufort Island), 118 (Mount Melbourne), 154 (Botany Bay), 155 (Cape Evans) and 156 (Lewis Bay). New Zealand noted that the review process for ASPA 105 had been initiated, but could not be completed as local sea ice conditions did not allow a visit to take place in the 2007/08 season. In informing the Committee on changes made to the management plans of these ASPAs, New Zealand noted that:

- there had been only minor changes made to the provisions of the existing Management Plan of ASPA 118 (Mount Melbourne);
- some substantial changes were introduced in the existing Management Plan of ASPA 154 (Botany Bay), relating to the re-drawing of the Managed Zone boundary, permits for access to the area for conservation visits to historic sites, and substantial changes in the maps to include vegetation cover;
- a substantial change had been made to the provisions of the existing Management Plan for ASPA 155 (Cape Evans) to allow vehicle access into the area. This change was required to overcome the immediate extreme risk to the hut from ice and snow build up. Vehicles will be used for ice and snow removal; and
- no changes to Management Plan for ASPA 156 (Lewis Bay) were proposed given the enduring nature of the values and the absence of any other concerns regarding the Area.

(201) With only minor changes to the Management Plan for ASPA 154 (Botany Bay), the Committee agreed to send the management plans for ASPAs 118 (Mount Melbourne), 154 (Botany Bay) and 155 (Cape Evans) to the ATCM for adoption, noting the existing Management Plan for ASPA 156 (Lewis Bay) remains extant.

(202) Australia presented WP 31 on the review of three management plans: ASPAs 135 (North-east Bailey Peninsula), 143 (Marine Plain), 160 (Frazier Islands) noting that:

- no changes were required to the Management Plan for ASPA 143 (Marine Plain);
- changes to the Management Plan for ASPA 135 (North-east Bailey Peninsula) included new provisions to allow for limited and appropriate vehicle access for the purposes of safe maintenance of essential communications equipment, updating of the list of supporting documentation and updating of the appendixes summarising species information;
- an introduction had been added to the Management Plan of ASPA 160 (Frazier Islands), an appendix on observations of southern giant petrel was updated, the provisions for conducting censuses of this species were modified, and the supporting documentation was updated.

(203) With respect to the revised Management Plan for ASPA 135, Japan asked Australia for clarification regarding the use of vehicles which was not in the current Management Plan. Also with respect to the revised Management Plan for ASPA 160, Japan asked Australia for clarification regarding the change in the length of time allowed for censuses. Australia explained the reasons for these changes and the Committee agreed to forward the management plans to the ATCM for adoption. The Committee also noted that the Management Plan for ASPA 143 had been reviewed and required no revision.

(204) In presenting WP 32 on the issue of ASPA 141, Japan informed the Meeting that a visit by the Japanese Antarctic Research Expedition to the area in February 2008 indicated that no changes to the value of the Area's unique ecosystem were observed, and therefore, the Management Plan was still effective.

(205) The Committee agreed, noting that the existing Management Plan remains in force.

(206) Chile introduced WP 47 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 125, Fildes Peninsula, King George Island (Isla 25 de Mayo)*. Chile noted that the area was currently insufficient to protect the fossils found in the area. Following recent studies in the region, the area of the ASPA was being extended to include eight areas containing fossils.

(207) Germany thanked Chile for developing the revised plan and agreed that extra protection was required in this area. However, recent German findings differed from those presented by Chile with respect to the precise areas requiring protection. Germany referred to its earlier intervention with respect to developing a broader ASMA for the Fildes Peninsula region, noting that this Management Plan should also be included in the broader review.

(208) The Committee agreed to refer the Management Plan for further intersessional review.

iii. New draft management plans for protected/managed areas

(209) After a presentation by Korea, the Committee considered WP 3 *Proposal for a new Antarctic Specially Protected Area at Narêbski Point, Barton Peninsula, King George Island* (Republic of Korea.). Korea noted that the area had high species richness of flora and fauna, and the abundance of some of these was, in some cases, exceptional. The cover of mosses, lichens, and grasses was very extensive. The area contains the largest Chinstrap penguin colony in King George Island, a large number of gentoo penguins and breeding areas of seven other birds. As such, the area provides exceptional opportunities for the scientific study of terrestrial biological communities. The Management Plan aims to protect the unique terrestrial ecosystem found in the Area and, in particular, to reduce the risk of invasive species introductions from both local and global sources.

(210) The Committee thanked Korea for its presentation and agreed to refer this new ASPA Management Plan for intersessional review.

(211) Argentina noted that it would be pleased to participate in this intersessional review and provide data and information, given its scientific experience in the area.

(212) CEP Advice 4 to the ATCM:

The Committee had before it 21 new or revised protected or managed area management plans. Five of these had been subject to review by the Trial Informal Group (TIG) established by CEP X. 16 new or revised management plans had been submitted directly to CEP XI.

In reviewing the advice of the TIG, and following the Committee's assessment of those plans that had not been subject to intersessional review, the Committee decided to:

- Forward the following 14 management plans to the ATCM, with the recommendation that they be adopted by AT:

#	Name
ASMA new	<i>South-west Anvers Island and Palmer Basin</i>
ASPA new	<i>Mount Harding, Grove Mount, East Antarctic</i>
ASPA new	<i>Amanda Bay, Ingrid Christensen Coast, Princess Elizabeth Land, East Antarctica</i>
ASPA new	<i>Marion Nunataks, Charcot Island, Antarctic Peninsula</i>
ASPA 118	<i>'Cryptogam Ridge' Mount Melbourne, Victoria Land</i>
ASPA 123	<i>Barwick and Balham Valley, Victoria Land</i>
ASPA 124	<i>Cape Crozier, Ross Island</i>
ASPA 135	<i>North-eastern Bailey Peninsula, Budd Coast, Wilkes Land</i>
ASPA 137	<i>North-west White Island, McMurdo Sound</i>
ASPA 138	<i>Linnaeus Terrace, Asgaard Range, Victoria Land</i>
ASPA 154	<i>Botany Bay, Cape Geology, Victoria Land</i>
ASPA 155	<i>Cape Evans, Ross Island</i>
ASPA 160	<i>Frazier Islands, Wilkes land, East Antarctica</i>
ASPA 161	<i>Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea</i>

- Forward the following four management plans for further intersessional review:

#	Name
ASPANew	<i>Narębski Point, Barton Peninsula, King George Island</i>
ASPANew 106	<i>Cape Hallett, Victoria Land</i>
ASPANew 125	<i>Fildes Peninsula, King George Island, South Shetland Islands</i>
ASPANew 150	<i>Ardley Island, Maxwell Bay, King George Island</i>

The Committee also advised that the following three management plans had been reviewed according to the requirements of Annex V, but no changes had been made and therefore the existing plans remain in force:

#	Name
ASPANew 141	<i>'Yukidori Valley', Langhovde, Lützow-Holmbukta</i>
ASPANew 143	<i>Marine Plain, Mule Peninsula, Vestfold Hills, Princess Elizabeth Land</i>
ASPANew 156	<i>Lewis Bay, Mount Erebus, Ross Island</i>

iv. Other matters relating to management plans for protected / managed areas

(213) The Chair noted Secretariat Paper 6 *Register of the Status of Antarctic Specially Protected Area and Antarctic Specially Managed Area Management Plans* recalling that this information is available online at the CEP website.

(214) Romania presented IP 64 *Grove Mountains, East Antarctica - between scientific research and environmental protection*, on the field-based research in the region since 2003, during the Chinese Antarctic Expedition. Romania suggested that the objectives of a future Management Plan of Grove Mountains should include also biological data of the area and that it will make efforts to increase knowledge of the environmental importance of the Area, and the impacts of human activities.

7b) Historic sites and monuments

(215) Chile introduced WP 61 *Antarctic Protected Area System: Revised List of Historic Sites and Monuments Measure 3 (2003) Guidelines for its Application*, recalling earlier decisions taken by the ATCM to manage historic sites and monuments, including Resolution 4 (2001), and Resolution 8 (1995). Chile also recalled that through Measure 3 (2003) the ATCM consolidated the "List of Historic Monuments Identified and Described by the Proposing Government or Governments" updating the information and removing sites or monuments which no longer exist.

(216) Chile considered that taking these provisions into account it still remains important and useful to consolidate the existing provisions on HSMs, in order to maintain and improve the quality of the protection afforded to the present sites and monuments, and appropriately build on the established rules and procedures to manage the List of Historic Sites and Monuments. Therefore Chile proposed new guidelines to focus on the ATCM List of Historic Sites and Monuments as a more comprehensive management tool.

(217) Several Members supported Chile's proposal in principle, noting some concerns over certain aspects of the proposed guidelines. The Committee agreed to ask Chile to coordinate an intersessional review of the proposed guidelines, together with interested Members and to present an updated version to the next meeting.

(218) The other paper submitted under this agenda ítem was IP 12 *Recuperación del Sitio Histórico N° 56 Base Aérea Antártica "Pdte. Gabriel González Videla"* (Chile).

7c) *Site guidelines*

(219) Ukraine introduced WP 2 *Site Guidelines for Wordie House, Winter Island, Argentine Islands*, (United Kingdom & Ukraine). Ukraine noted that Wordie House is the site of the British 'Base F', which had been recognised for its historical importance and adopted as HSM 62 in 1995. The UK had carried out a heritage survey in February 2007- this included a detailed description of the site with recommendations for its future management. Vernadsky station undertakes management of the Base "F" on behalf of the UK.

(220) In presenting WP 40, *Site Guidelines for Shingle Cove, Coronation Island*, the United Kingdom recalled that the area is located on the southern shore of Coronation Island, opposite to Signy Research Station (UK). The UK emphasised that it is a biologically rich site. The aim of the site guidelines was primarily to protect nesting snow petrels from human disturbance.

(221) The United Kingdom also introduced WP 44, *Site Guidelines for Devil Island, Vega Island*. Devil Island is a narrow island lying in the centre of a bay on the north coast of Vega Island. This small island is a popular landing site for visitors and possesses a large breeding colony of Adelie penguins (approximately 8,500 pairs). Skuas also breed there, while other bird species, including kelp gull, sheathbill and Wilson's storm-petrel are suspected to nest on the island. A number of plant species are observed on the higher slopes of the north eastern peak and a large area of moss species is situated on the flat area behind the penguin colony.

(222) The UK thanked IAATO for its assistance and support in drawing up all three of the Site Guidelines.

(223) On behalf of its co-authors Norway introduced WP 56, *Site Guidelines for Whalers Bay, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands*, (Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, UK and US, in conjunction with IAATO and ASOC), noting that it was pleasing to see so many Site Guidelines on the Agenda. Whalers Bay is located on Deception Island, South Shetland Islands and over the last 10 years has continuously been one of the most visited tourist sites in Antarctica. The entire site is recognised for its historical importance and has been adopted as HSM 71 in 2003. The site also has important wilderness and environmental values, a number of bird species breed in the area, and several seal and penguin species use the beach as a resting place. Important or unique floral species and assemblages are also present.

(224) Norway recalled that the Management Plan for ASMA 4 includes a conservation strategy for Whalers Bay, which included a Code of Conduct for Visitors to the site. The Deception Island Management Group saw merit in reformatting the Code of Conduct to be consistent with guidelines adopted for other sites. The Deception Island Management Group therefore recommended the CEP submit these site guidelines for Whalers Bay for endorsement by the ATCM.

(225) Argentina introduced WP 59 *Guidelines for Half Moon Island, South Shetland Islands* stating that the growing number of visitors that had been in evidence at this site during past years, which had reached 15,000 tourist landings from 30 cruise ships during the 2006/07 season, had turned the site into one of the four most visited tourist locations in Antarctica. Argentina proposed these guidelines in order to improve protection measures associated with potential impacts from visitors on the flora and fauna present on the island. Argentina also advised that Cámara Station is not part of the area considered in the guidelines.

(226) IAATO noted that it was pleased to work in conjunction with Parties on development of these guidelines.

(227) In presenting WP 45 *Site Guidelines for Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea*, the United States informed the Meeting that, since the guidelines were associated with the revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No 106, and the Management Plan was referred for intersessional review, it had decided to postpone the site guideline proposal for CEP XII.

(228) Several Members made comments on particular issues regarding the proposed site guidelines, mainly connected with the description of values to be protected, total number and time ashore of visitors permitted, movement of visitors through the landing areas, and cleaning procedures before landing. On this issue, IAATO reminded the meeting that for IAATO visitors the site guidelines were complemented by a suite of management provisions aimed at minimising disturbance.

(229) Regarding the site guidelines proposed for *Wordie House, Winter Island, Argentine Islands* in WP 2 some delegations expressed concern about a reference made in a footnote to a particular national policy on visits to historic sites. The UK noted with regret that although there was consensus on the guidelines themselves it had not been possible to agree revised wording for the footnote on UK management of this base. Reluctantly, the co-proponents, UK and Ukraine, had decided to withdraw the proposal from the CEP meeting. The UK assured the Committee that the existing good management practices would continue to be followed and the draft site guidelines would be passed to IAATO for implementation by its members.

(230) IAATO expressed its disappointment that these guidelines were not agreed. It assured the Committee that IAATO members would follow the provisions of the proposed guidelines.

(231) After modification by the proponents of some topics proposed by Members, the Committee endorsed and recommended the approval by the ATCM of the following site guidelines:

- Shingle Cove, Coronation Island
- Devil Island, Vega Island
- Whalers Bay, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands
- Half Moon Island, South Shetland Islands

(232) IAATO introduced IP 82 *Update on the Antarctic Peninsula Landing Site Use and Site Guidelines* focusing on the application of the ATCM site guidelines during this past season, level of use and relevant issues. IAATO highlighted the importance placed on education to ensure continued good understanding and compliance with the guidelines and noted that the organisation was developing an online field staff training and assessment programme. IAATO also drew attention to key issues which need to be addressed to ensure continued success of the ATCM site guidelines: the need for an efficient systematic review process of the guidelines; the importance of good coordination between all visiting parties and assurance that all visitor activities are included in a single tourism database.

(233) After this presentation, France posed a general issue related to the visitor site guidelines objectives and effectiveness, noting that several guidelines adopted during the last three years had standard wording, which was not related to the specific characteristics of each site. France emphasised some specific issues which should be defined taking into account the site features and its environmental sensitivities such as the distance to approach fauna and the number of people ashore.

(234) Other Members raised issues connected to the maximum number of people including guides inside historic ASPAs and huts and expressed concern on how this was being managed to avoid damage to those values. On this matter IAATO agreed with New Zealand that the number of people inside a hut and in the environs of ASPAs related to historic sites was important to ensure protection of the historic artefacts. IAATO also noted its view that limits were important to safeguard the visitor experience. In areas where space is less constricted, it may be more effective for management purposes to restrict the maximum number of visitors, excluding guides.

(235) ASOC noted that in its view, placing limits to visitor numbers could be used as an environmental management tool at any site as a precautionary action to minimise impacts. Spain showed its agreement with the comments made by ASOC with regard to the benefits for environmental protection entailed by placing limits on visitor numbers in those areas of the Antarctic where environmental precautionary action so requires.

(236) Other Members noted that specific codes of conduct adopted by National Antarctic Programmes for certain sites often visited by tourists could be used as a basis to develop site guidelines as done for Whalers Bay. IAATO noted that when the ATCM site guidelines

were first considered, the ICG, noting the existence of Recommendation XVIII-1, discussed considering the development of a general code of conduct as a ‘cover sheet’ for the guidelines in due course. IAATO observed that it may now be time reconsider this issue and IAATO would be happy to be involved in drafting any such general guidelines.

(237) Argentina noted that Recommendation XVIII-1 was still not in force. The Chair proposed to transmit to the ATCM the urgency in the approval of this important management instrument to better protect the Antarctic environment from possible impacts associated with tourist activity.

(238) After further interventions on this issue, France agreed to coordinate an intersessional discussion with interested Members, to identify those issues which might constitute general guidance, perhaps as a generic cover sheet to site guidelines, and those issues which merit site specific guidance and report back to CEP XII.

(239) The following paper was also submitted under this Agenda item: IP 6 rev.1 *Antarctic Site Inventory: 1994-2008* (United States).

7d) Systematic environmental geographic framework

(240) New Zealand introduced WP 27 *Systematic Environmental Protection in Antarctica: Final report on Environmental Domains Analysis for the Antarctic continent as a dynamic model for a systematic environmental geographic framework for Annex V of the Protocol*, recalling that, since 2000, it had been working on a systematic environmental geographic framework (SEGF) in order to provide substance to this undefined phrase in Article 3(2) of Annex V of the Protocol.

(241) New Zealand noted that Version 2.0 of the classification framework, identifying 21 different Environments, was the best possible achievement using currently available climate, slope, land cover and geological data. Further continental-scale data (e.g. on lakes, biota, biogeography and soils) would be useful when available. Until then the Environmental Domain Analysis (EDA) addressed the immediate need. Version 2.0 provided a scientifically sound basis for a systematic spatial classification of Antarctica into Environments of quantifiable character. New Zealand suggested that examining environmental risk to Environments poorly represented amongst the existing Antarctic Specially Protected and Managed Areas would be an essential next step for the CEP to take.

(242) New Zealand therefore recommended:

- the EDA to the CEP as a dynamic model for a systematic environmental geographic framework (provided for in Article 3(2) of Annex V of the Protocol) for the Antarctic continent; and
- that the CEP request the support of the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat, specific Parties and/or COMNAP to disseminate the EDA, including making *Environmental Domains of Antarctica Version 2.0 Final Report*, Manaaki

Whenua Landcare Research New Zealand Ltd (Morgan *et al.*, Manaaki Whenua Landcare Research New Zealand, 2007) available on the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat website.

(243) Many Parties congratulated New Zealand on what was a major accomplishment, noting that the model proposed for use by the CEP was the result of sustained work over a number of years. EDA would be a practical systematic tool for the CEP to use to help protect the Antarctic environment. Version 2.0 gave a better characterization of the ice-free areas. As well as including more representative areas, it would be important to look particularly at which Environments were vulnerable.

(244) Australia and COMNAP offered support in making the EDA more widely available. It was noted that EDA was an example of an environmental classification that is also being referred to as bioregionalisation in the marine environment. A number of applications were noted such as the representation of ASPAs and the role of the ASPA system, environmental monitoring, statistics about human activities, assessing risks from invasion of non-native species, its surrogacy value and general conservation planning.

(245) SCAR noted that it was in the process of assessing the EDA using data on terrestrial biodiversity.

(246) Argentina noted that each proposed ASPA would still need to be considered on its own merits.

(247) ASOC also noted that EDA would provide a valuable tool for extending the ASPA system.

(248) The UK noted the similarities between the methodologies and objectives of the environmental domain analysis and the marine bioregionalization work. In particular it highlighted the potential for developing common applications for these marine and terrestrial classifications.

(249) The Committee strongly endorsed the EDA as a dynamic model for the identification of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas within the Systematic Environmental Geographic Framework (SEGF) referred to in Article 3(2) of Annex V, and recommended that the ATCM adopt a Resolution “*Environmental domains Analysis for the Antarctic continent as a dynamic model for a systematic environmental geographic framework*”.

7e) Other Annex V matters

(250) The United Kingdom introduced WP 41 *Guidance for Working Papers on Area Protection and Management*, reminding the meeting that the proposal had been considered by ATCM XXX and that Parties had been encouraged to use the guidance during the intersessional period on a trial basis.

(251) Australia suggested a minor amendment to Template A in the document to more accurately reflect the process agreed in Decision 9 (2005) for consultation with CCAMLR

on proposed areas with a marine component. The Committee agreed with this suggestion and endorsed the amended version of the Guide.

(252) The United Kingdom introduced IP 2 *Workshop on Bioregionalisation of the Southern Ocean (Brussels, Belgium, August 2007)*, (United Kingdom and United States) informing the meeting that the aim of the Workshop was to provide a scientific basis for the identification of representative areas for protection in the Southern Ocean. The United Kingdom noted that the results of the Workshop had been endorsed by CCAMLR at its meetings in 2007 and that CCAMLR had agreed that these results were sufficient to allow progress on developing practical approaches to the selection of marine areas for protection.

(253) The United Kingdom also presented IP 3 *Proposed approach for the identification of important marine areas for conservation*, proposing an approach for the identification of important marine areas for conservation based on “Systematic Conservation Planning” methodology, noting that they intend to undertake a pilot study to identify key decisions and data sets required. South Africa offered to provide its expertise in this matter.

(254) Australia and IUCN strongly supported the development of a representative network of protected areas in the Southern Ocean. Australia felt it would be appropriate for the Committee to echo CCAMLR’s endorsement of the workshop recommendations and agree that the results can be used by the CEP and CCAMLR to inform marine spatial management.

(255) The Committee agreed that further work on this topic is of key importance and Members were encouraged to continue working with CCAMLR to utilise the outcomes of the CCAMLR-CEP bioregionalisation workshop.

(256) IUCN noted that the ATCM would benefit from endorsing the UK approach described in IP 3 and encouraged other Members to conduct similar studies to contribute to the development of best guidance to identify important marine areas for conservation.

(257) Japan recorded its position that in general the matter of marine protected areas should be mainly discussed in the CCAMLR context.

(258) The United Kingdom pointed out that Article 3 of Annex V of the Protocol confirmed that the development of marine ASPAs and ASMAs is within the CEP’s remit, noting that the working relationship with CCAMLR, including through ATCM Decision 9 (2005), was very important. Australia recorded its agreement with the United Kingdom’s statements.

(259) The CCAMLR observer informed the CEP that CCAMLR had endorsed the administrative procedures, introduced by the CCAMLR Secretariat in 2007, to ensure that ATCM proposals for protected areas with marine components are reviewed without undue delay by CCAMLR following ATCM Decision 9 (2005).

(260) Germany presented IP 30 *Final Report on the Research Project “Risk assessment for Fildes Peninsula and Ardley Island and the development of management plans for designation as Antarctic Specially Protected or Managed Areas”* informing the meeting that this project had been carried out between 2003 and 2006. The document contained a summary as well

as a detailed version of the report. Germany also made available a CD version of the final report, and informed the Meeting that the full report could also be downloaded from the Umweltbundesamt (UBA) webpage and that the printed version could be sent out to each contracting party on request.

(261) Romania presented IP 64 *Grove Mountains, East Antarctica – Between scientific research and environmental protection*, noting its intention to gather more data.

(262) Brazil introduced IP 117, *The Admiralty Bay ASMA website*, demonstrating the website for the CEP (www.admiraltybayasma.aq).

(263) ASOC presented IP 57 *Area Protection: Time for Action*, noting their view that the rolling Annex review process offers an opportunity to both consider the effectiveness of Annex V to deliver best practice area protection for the Antarctic Treaty area, and to review the barriers to effective implementation of current requirements.

(264) Other papers submitted under this agenda item were IP 94 *Ross Sea Heritage Conservation Project: Conservation of Shackleton's Hut, Cape Royds, ASPA 157* (New Zealand), IP 109 *Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station, South Pole Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA 5) First Year Management Report* (United States), and IP 126 *Report of the Deception Island Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) Management Group* (Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom, and United States).

Item 8: Conservation of Antarctic Fauna and Flora

8a) Quarantine and non-native species

(265) Australia introduced WP 16 *Antarctic Alien Species Database*, advising the Meeting that the Australian Antarctic Division maintained a Biodiversity Database in support of the SCAR Life Sciences Program Evolution and Biodiversity in the Antarctic (EBA). This contained species records from the Antarctic and sub-Antarctic, including observations of over 190 alien species. It can be searched by species, geographic region, or alien status (transient, persistent, invasive).

(266) Australia reminded Members that the provisional CEP Five Year Work Plan adopted at CEP X included as a suggested action “establish a database of non-native species occurrences in Antarctica” and therefore Australia recommended that the Committee encourage Members to use the Biodiversity Database as the central database of alien species occurrences in the Antarctic region.

(267) The Committee and SCAR supported the Australian recommendation, with SCAR noting that its EBA committee consistently screened incoming data.

(268) IUCN noted the importance of such databases and highlighted the need for further work on marine alien species.

(269) Australia presented IP 17 *Measures to protect the Larsemann Hills, East Antarctica, from the introduction of non-native species*, (Australia, China, India, Romania and the Russian Federation) noting that, in accordance with the high priority given by the CEP's proposed five-year action plan, the Parties active in ASMA No 6 were instituting a range of precautionary measures aimed at minimizing the accidental introduction of non-native species, and high risk quarantine materials to the Larsemann Hills.

(270) In response to a question from New Zealand, Australia noted that the Parties were in the process of implementing these measures, which were not expected to require significant additional resources. The Larsemann Hills Parties would consider reporting back to future meetings on progress.

(271) Uruguay presented IP 33 *Medidas preventivas para evitar la introducción de especies alienas en la Antártida, en cumplimiento del Anexo II del Protocolo*.

(272) New Zealand presented IP 75 *Non-native Species Incursions at Scott Base, Antarctica* on a significant incursion of vinegar flies (*Drosophilae*) at Scott Base during 2007, and the response and management of that incident. New Zealand noted that the application of the recommendations from the 2006's *Non-native Species in Antarctica Workshop* resulted in a more comprehensive reporting system on these sorts of incursions.

(273) A number of Members noted that it was useful to share experiences about the control and eradication of such incursions, which appeared to be linked often to the importation of human food-stuffs.

(274) The United States submitted IP 93 rev. 1 *Non-native Species Awareness Campaign: "Don't Pack a Pest" When Travelling to Antarctica*, on an awareness programme aimed at reducing the risk of introduction of non-native species to Antarctica.

(275) COMNAP presented IP 98 *Survey on existing procedures concerning introduction of non native species in Antarctica*, which was undertaken by its Antarctic Environmental Officers Network (AEON) in regard to existing procedures within National Antarctic Programmes to minimize introduction of alien species. The survey was based on three main topics: awareness programmes; operational procedures; and monitoring/surveillance programmes. COMNAP informed the Meeting that the survey had shown that the issue was already addressed by most National Antarctic Programmes through awareness programs, and that a significant number of Programmes also implemented a range of operational procedures aimed at minimising the risk of introduction of non-native species. Lessons learnt from this survey will be useful to National Antarctic Programmes to continue improve their procedures. COMNAP will keep the CEP informed.

(276) The United States introduced IP 110 *Report on Exploration of Antarctic Subglacial Aquatic Environments; Environmental and Scientific Stewardship*. This made a series of recommendations to help manage risk to subglacial environments while allowing exploration and sampling of these environments to occur.

(277) A number of Members and ASOC congratulated the United States on this important paper. The Chair noted its importance with regards to environmental impact assessment, non-native species and area protection. The Committee agreed to further assess the report intersessionally and looked forward to further discussion at CEP XII.

(278) References were also made to *Aliens in Antarctica*, a SCAR-sponsored IPY project being led by Australia. SCAR noted that further details on the results of the project would be reported to the CEP at future meetings.

(279) The Chair noted that the reports delivered under that agenda item would contribute to the development of the CEP's future work on non-native species as prioritized in the 5 year work plan.

8b) Specially protected species

(280) SCAR introduced WP 10 rev. 1 *Status of the Regional, Antarctic Population of the Southern Giant Petrel – Progress*, and summarized the steps taken by SCAR to advise the ATCM on whether the southern giant petrel should be listed as a Specially Protected Species (SPS) under Annex II to the Protocol on Environmental Protection, particularly a workshop held in Cambridge in May 2008, where members of several parties, SCAR, BirdLife International and ACAP had participated. For the purposes of this workshop, SCAR compiled an extensive database on abundance and trends of the species at all known breeding sites, and scrutinized the data according to the IUCN red list criteria for regional assessments.

(281) SCAR also raised several caveats. First, that data for several sites are not current, but that by comparison with assessments for other bird species globally, the data are extensive. Second, that data on fledging success, juvenile and adult survival, and breeding frequency are available for only a few breeding sites, and much variation exists between these site-specific data, so precluding demographic modelling of future trends. Third, that census data at sites are often not comparable among years.

(282) SCAR concluded that:

- According to the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria, the southern giant petrel population south of 60°S is of Least Concern under Criteria A2 and B-E. Therefore it does not qualify as Critically Endangered, Endangered, Vulnerable or Near Threatened, and the present data and analysis do not support the designation of the southern giant petrel as a SPS under Annex II.
- Additional censuses of breeding sites and of fledging success should be undertaken in a consistent scientific manner, which SCAR outlined, to enable better estimates to be made of current trends in the southern giant petrel population (north and south of 60°S). Should such work indicate a change in the status of the species, it should be reassessed.
- Further quantitative work should be undertaken, using both current and new data, so that quantitative demographic models can be applied to the species.

Because these models rely on carefully collected, time series information, the collection of such information was encouraged.

- Sites that have been censused more than 10 years ago should be revisited at an appropriate time so that an assessment of the status of the species at these sites can be made.
- The lessons learnt from this process should be applied to other species.

(283) A number of Members thanked SCAR for the quality of its advice, noting it was a good example of cooperation between the CEP and SCAR. The SCAR recommendations were supported.

(284) Australia stated that making the workshop data available to ACAP would assist with its global assessment of the species and would also help with determining the level of uncertainty with the Antarctic regional assessment. Australia strongly supported the development of a standardised methodology for population counts, and suggested the guidance contained in SCAR's paper could be referred to ACAP for consideration and further advice to the CEP if required. It also noted that the current assessment does not reduce the sensitivity of the species to disturbance, so the Parties should continue the commitments made in earlier Resolutions to limit such disturbance, including by taking steps to protect breeding habitat. These sentiments were endorsed by the Committee.

(285) The UK described its future plans for survey and for continued convening of the ACAP breeding sites working group, and noted that advice and cooperation from experts within SCAR and CEP would be appreciated.

(286) IUCN also noted that the IUCN Red List status of the species, released in May 2008, is "near threatened" and that the Red List assessment notes the ongoing threats from Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing. The assessment also recommended conservation measures including, continued monitoring, minimising disturbance at breeding sites, and adoption of mitigation measures in all fisheries within the species range.

(287) New Zealand presented WP 30 rev. 3 *Draft Action Plan for Southern Giant Petrel *Macronectes giganteus**, noting that the primary objective of the document was to provide a means of continuing to test the *Guidelines for CEP Consideration of Proposals for New and Revised Designations of Antarctic Specially Protected Species under Annex II of the Protocol* adopted at CEP VIII and to illustrate how a draft Action Plan could be developed following the accompanying template.

(288) New Zealand noted that this test of the CEP's SPS guidelines had been conducted in the full knowledge that the range of southern giant petrels included areas outside of the Antarctic Treaty area and CAMLR Convention areas and, therefore, the concept of the Antarctic environment and dependent and associated ecosystems was particularly relevant to the protection of southern giant petrels. New Zealand also expressed that hopefully the test would be useful in clarifying the roles of the CEP, CCAMLR and the Antarctic Treaty Parties on this matter.

(289) Several Members thanked New Zealand for producing a useful model, noting that, together with SCAR's robust review, the process of producing the Action Plan was a good test of the CEP's guidelines and the process for collaboration between the CEP and the Scientific Committee on CAMLR about protected marine species.

(290) France noted that it intends to make use of the draft action plan for its own management purposes and encouraged other Members to do so.

(291) Noting that the Parties that had contributed to the draft Action Plan largely operate in East Antarctica, Australia invited Parties with experience of the Antarctic Peninsula region to consider whether the types of actions identified in the plan would be appropriate to that region also.

(292) The Committee agreed that because the southern giant petrel would not be listed as a Specially Protected Species, it was not appropriate to formally adopt the draft as an Action Plan. The draft action plan would be made available through the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat website as an example, and for comment.

8c) *Marine acoustics*

(293) Germany noted that its work on a strategic risk assessment for Antarctic marine acoustics was still progressing. Germany anticipated providing a full report to CEP XI.

8d) *Other matters relating to the conservation of Antarctic fauna and flora*

(294) The United Kingdom submitted IP 21 *Update on Wildlife Awareness Information for Aircraft Operations in Antarctica* on a development of larger-scale maps using information about the location of wildlife concentrations. These maps were designed to support helicopter operations in Antarctica and to assist pilots in planning their routes so that they avoid wildlife concentrations.

(295) Ecuador introduced IP 107 *Censos del Petrel Gigante del Sur *Macronectes giganteus* y las skúas *Catharacta spp* en la Punta Fort Williams-Isla Greenwich y la Isla Barrientos, Shetland del Sur, Antártida*, informing the meeting on the results of the census of southern giant petrels and skuas undertaken during January and February 2007. The document was provided in due time for SCAR's consideration with regard to changes in the southern giant petrel population and the workshop that was organised at their headquarters in May 2008.

Item 9: Environmental Monitoring and Reporting

9a) *Climate change*

(296) Norway introduced WP 35 *Antarctic Climate Change Issues* (Norway and United Kingdom). In introducing the paper, Norway noted that climate change is one of the main challenges faced in Antarctica, and a priority area for the CEP as identified in the five-year

work plan. Norway stressed that climate change and its impacts are likely to have knock-on impacts on Antarctic activities, and that it therefore is important to consider consequences of climate change for Antarctica at a broad level and also for more specific management and protection.

(297) The document proposed several recommendations for actions that Parties should take. These included:

- ensuring Resolution 3 (2007) is followed up and reporting activities in this regard;
- SCAR being asked to keep the CEP updated on new knowledge on climate changes and its effects in Antarctica;
- asking COMNAP to continue to collect and disseminate experience on alternative energy production and good practice to help reduce greenhouse gases in Antarctica;
- encouraging National Operators and others as appropriate to further cooperate and coordinate logistics to reduce emissions;
- the CEP developing a clear methodology for calculating emissions and considering how to incorporate such information into the EIA process; and
- convening an Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts in 2009 to assess the consequences of climate change in Antarctica for the management of Antarctica and to consider the necessary practical and legal steps to meet related challenges.

(298) SCAR introduced IP 62 *Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment: A Progress Report*. SCAR noted that the Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment (ACCE) project was aimed at providing an up-to-date assessment of the climatic changes that had taken place on the Antarctic continent and across the Southern Ocean, to give improved estimates of how the climate might evolve over the next century and to examine the possible impact on the biota and other aspects of the environment.

(299) SCAR informed the Committee that the final published report would be a comprehensive approach taking into account the role of Antarctica as a major component of the global system, the climate variability and the Antarctic, the history of the Antarctic climate and environment, the changes registered during the ‘instrumental’ period of the last several decades as well as the predicted evolution of the Antarctic climate over the next 100 years. The report would be circulated widely for comment, including to the CEP and CCAMLR, during July and August, and SCAR would welcome feedback.

(300) Many Members welcomed both papers and expressed concern at the environmental changes described in SCAR’s report, although recognising that uncertainties still remain. The importance of research including sustained scientific monitoring to understand trends, supported by Resolution 3 (2007), was stressed.

(301) Some Members considered that some of the recommendations in WP 35 needed to be clarified, for example the frequency in reporting to the CEP. In addition, some Members suggested that legal matters needed to be addressed in other fora rather than being duplicated by the ATCM, but that a meeting of Antarctic experts might be useful. It was agreed that ATCPs had the responsibility to lead by example and to take account of consequences and risks for the management of the Antarctic environment.

(302) The UK noted that Members had acknowledged that climate change was important for the CEP to consider and that the Committee should examine the management of climate change impacts on the Antarctic environment and the associated fauna and flora. To this end scientific research in this area is vital.

(303) The Committee discussed the need to reduce emissions in Antarctica, with some Members noting that Antarctic emissions are insignificant on a global scale, with some other Members noting that even at a local scale the significance of emissions was minor. Some Members noted the ethical importance of reducing emissions and leading by example using best practice. It was noted that some Parties were already taking actions consistent with the recommendations in WP 35, including by COMNAP on alternate fuels, fuel handling and other mitigation measures.

(304) In summarising the discussions the Chair noted:

- the concerns that had been expressed on the impacts of climate change on the Antarctic environment;
- the importance that Members had placed on the need for ongoing scientific research in the Antarctic, and the need to place a high priority on long term monitoring, as set out in Resolution 3 (2007);
- that the Committee had welcomed SCAR's progress report on Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment, recognising that it would be an important part of the Committee's future work to review the findings of the report when it is available in early 2009;
- that in the light of the findings of SCAR's report the Committee would have an opportunity to assess the environmental management implications of a changing Antarctic climate;
- the Committee may wish to reconsider the proposal for a meeting of Antarctic experts to focus on climate change in the Antarctic context, after the SCAR report was available; and
- the ongoing efforts by National Antarctic Programmes and COMNAP to reduce emissions in the Antarctic, and that some Members had also commented on the underpinning ethical responsibilities in this area.

(305) The Committee welcomed the Chair's summary and looked forward to future discussions on this issue.

(306) ASOC introduced IP 56 *Impacts of Climate Change on Antarctic Ecosystems* providing a further review of the latest science and emphasizing the value of full consideration of climate change management decisions.

(307) Other papers submitted under this agenda item were IP 23 *Australia's Antarctic and Southern Ocean Climate Science* (Australia), IP 50 *Antarctic Peninsula: rapid warming in a pristine environment* (United Kingdom), and IP 51 *Antarctic Peninsula: Ice shelf status* (United Kingdom). The United Kingdom distributed a useful composite map of ice shelf change in the Antarctic Peninsula.

9b) Other environmental monitoring and reporting matters

(308) The CCAMLR observer delivered an informative presentation on CCAMLR's work, including ecosystem monitoring, which provided very useful background for the CEP and in respect of the joint SC-CAMLR and CEP workshop (see paragraphs 337 to 346).

(309) Belgium introduced WP 55 *The Marine Biodiversity Information Network: 2010 and Beyond*, as an instrument for science-based management and invited Members to join the project, since funding by Belgium is not guaranteed beyond 2010. Several Members thanked Belgium for this excellent scientific tool which, it was noted, provided basic data for the Census of Antarctic Marine Life (CAML) and the SC-CAMLR and CEP workshop on bioregionalisation. Belgium also noted that the database was available at www.scarmarbin.be.

(310) New Zealand referred again to WP 24 *Improving the CEP's Role in Advising the ATCM on the State of Antarctic Environments*. It noted that the first three recommendations would help improve environmental monitoring and reporting.

(311) ASOC thanked the United Kingdom and France for their IP 54 *The Recovery of Drilling Fluid from a Deep Ice-Core Drilling Site on James Ross Island, Antarctic Peninsula*, noting the importance of such recovery, which had been the first successful remediation of a deep ice core bore hole in Antarctica.

(312) The Chair reminded the Meeting of the request from the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, for data and information on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in the Antarctic environment.

(313) Chile introduced IP 97 *Antarctic Persistent Organic Pollutants: Notes on a Request from the Stockholm Convention* regarding access to information from the Antarctic Treaty System. Several Parties and SCAR noted they had information or databases on the subject.

(314) SCAR agreed to coordinate this information for the CEP, should the ATCM decide to develop a consolidated Antarctic input to the Stockholm Convention.

(315) Other papers submitted under this agenda item included IP 07 *Summary of Environmental Monitoring and Reporting Discussion* (Australia), IP 35 *Environmental Monitoring of the Indian Permanent Station-Maitri in Pursuant to the Article 17 of Protocol*

on *Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (India), IP 118 *Brazilian contribution to the Monitoring Programme for the Admiralty Bay Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA No 1)* (Brazil), and IP 122 *Monitoring of Human Impacts at McMurdo Station, Antarctica* (United States).

Item 10: Inspection Reports

(316) The United States presented WP 26 *A Proposed Checklist for Inspecting Specially Protected and Managed Areas in Antarctica* (New Zealand, United Kingdom and United States) noting that it was a resubmission of an original proposal that had been made by the same proponents at CEP IX and that the matter had also been briefly considered at the CEP X.

(317) The US noted that the adoption of a checklist for inspecting specially protected and managed areas would provide an optional, though useful tool in carrying out inspections in those areas, complementing the set of inspection checklist adopted by the ATCM through Resolution 5 (1995). The US also noted that the draft checklist had been prepared and tested in Antarctica by inspecting five ASPAs and one ASMA in the 2005/06 season.

(318) Brazil commented on the usefulness of the checklist, noting that it had made use of them informally during the last summer in assessing the Admiralty Bay ASMA.

(319) France and Chile, supported by several other Members, expressed their support for this new checklist, noting that it remains a useful tool for future inspection of ASPAs and ASMAs, and carries no formal obligation to use it.

(320) Argentina stated that it was pleased to see that its comments on a previous draft were taken into account in this final version of the document. Consequently, Argentina supported the recommendation for adoption.

(321) Argentina introduced WP 54 *Proposal to revise the inspection checklists contained in Resolution 5 (1995)*, noting that considerable time had passed since the set of checklists were adopted. It proposed that, taking into account the experience gained with their extended use and considering that valuable information can be obtained from the Secretariat's Information Exchange System prior to the inspections visits, the list adopted in 1995 could be reviewed.

(322) Argentina proposed to establish an ICG in the framework of the ATCM to begin with the review of List A "*Permanent Antarctic Stations and Associated Installations*" appended to Resolution 5 (1995), as the first step towards revising all the lists included in the Resolution, and to urge the Parties to submit to the Secretariat the information required under the exchange of information requirements under the Antarctic Treaty and the Protocol.

(323) This proposition received unanimous support. Many Members and COMNAP notified their wish to participate in such an ICG if established by the ATCM.

(324) CEP Advice to the ATCM:

The Committee considered a proposed new checklist for inspecting protected and managed areas, and a separate proposal to review the existing inspection checklist A adopted under Resolution 5 (1995). The Committee agreed to forward the draft checklist for inspecting specially protected and managed areas in Antarctica to the ATCM for approval by means of a Resolution. The Committee supported the proposal for establishing an ATCM ICG to review the inspection checklist A.

Item 11: Emergency Response and Contingency Planning

(325) COMNAP introduced IP 91 *The COMNAP Fuel Manual, incorporating revised guidelines for fuel handling and storage in Antarctica*, informing the Committee that a set of four guidelines for fuel storage and handling in Antarctica had been developed by COMNAP between 1990 and 1993, and that they had provided valuable guidance to Antarctic operators for 15 years. COMNAP noted that the guidelines had been edited to make them compatible with the Protocol wording, and that the former four separate guidelines were reorganized in a single “COMNAP Fuel Manual” in which additional sections could be inserted as required.

(326) COMNAP stated that it will continue developing and updating the Fuel Manual and promoting and facilitating its use by all operators.

(327) The Committee thanked COMNAP for this work and for keeping the Committee informed.

Item 12: Waste Management

(328) Japan introduced IP 80 *Completion of a Four-year Campaign to Clean Up the Syowa Station Area*, covering its four-year programme to clean up the Syowa Station area from 2005 to 2008. The cleanup programme consisted of three major activities: cleaning up large old waste items like snow vehicles, an intensive cleanup campaign, and starting sewage treatment for the Summer Lodge building at Syowa.

(329) The Committee congratulated Japan on the successful cleanup programme.

Item 13: Prevention of Marine Pollution

(330) ASOC introduced IP 58 *Antarctic Shipping* noting the increase in the number and type of vessels operating in Antarctica, and that this increase raised environmental and marine safety issues. While there is considerable effort underway to improve the standards of shipping in the Antarctic region, not all proposed measures apply to all vessels operating in the region, and many international shipping instruments developed and adopted by the International Maritime Organization (IMO) over the past decades have not been ratified.

(331) ASOC undertook a review of the recent developments in the framework of IMO and the ATCM and made several recommendations to the ATCM, including a joint assessment

with IMO of the threats resulting from the full range of vessels operating in the region, increasing collaboration between national-level IMO and ATCM representatives, urgent ratification and full implementation of existing shipping instruments by ATCPs, and greater control by Flag and Port States over vessels operating in the Antarctic region.

(332) The Committee thanked ASOC for keeping it informed on this matter and noted the activities being undertaken within the IMO.

Item 14: Cooperation with Other Organisations

(333) The Chair introduced WP 28 *Report of the CEP Observer to the twenty-sixth meeting of the Scientific Committee to CCAMLR, 22 to 26 October 2007*. The Chair drew the Committee's attention to several matters arising from SC-CAMLR XXVI, noting in particular:

- the Scientific Committee's suggestion for a joint SC-CAMLR and CEP workshop in 2009. The Chair recommended that the Committee give consideration to agenda items for such a workshop, as well as a possible venue and timing;
- the Scientific Committee's decision to discontinue the Seal Island CCAMLR Ecosystem Monitoring Programme (CEMP) site as research was no longer undertaken in the area;
- the outcomes to the bioregionalisation workshop had been endorsed by the Scientific Committee and agreed that further work be undertaken within the context of its Working Group on Ecosystem Monitoring and Management (WG-EMM);
- the Scientific Committee's concern over the increasing interest in the krill fishery for the 2007/08 season;
- the attention given to developing a systematic process for assessing the impacts of bottom fishing on vulnerable marine ecosystems;
- the very low levels of marine mammal by-catch and zero levels of seabird by-catch in longline fisheries;
- the Scientific Committee's encouragement for its members to use and promote ACAP resources and to work with Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs) to reduce bird by-catch in fisheries adjacent to CCAMLR waters;
- the Scientific Committee's decision to establish a WG-EMM sub group on status and trends in predator populations.

(334) Argentina expressed its concern about the potential increase in the exploitation of krill, and its possible effects on the rest of the food web, especially on species of interest to the CEP under Annex II. Argentina wondered if the Committee could express its concern on this matter to the ATCM.

(335) The Committee noted the potential implication of declining krill stocks on those species covered by Annex II.

(336) The CCAMLR observer informed the Meeting that the current levels of krill catches had not increased despite the five-fold increase in notified catches for the 2007-08 season. The CCAMLR observer also reminded the CEP that the impact of krill fishing on krill dependent species is a central part of the risk-based ecosystem approach to management of marine resources taken by CCAMLR.

(337) Noting the proposal made by the CCAMLR Scientific Committee to hold a joint SC-CAMLR and CEP workshop in 2009, to further strengthen cooperation between the two bodies, the Committee was requested to give further consideration to this proposal, and to identify key agenda items for such a workshop.

(338) The Committee noted ATCM Resolution 1 (2006) on CCAMLR in the Antarctic Treaty System, which encourages increased cooperation between the ATCM and CCAMLR at a practical level in respect of the conservation and protection of the Antarctic environment.

(339) Noting also that there are several areas of common interest between the CEP and the SC-CAMLR, the Committee welcomed the proposal for a joint SC-CAMLR and CEP workshop, as an opportunity to consider ways in which to improve and maintain practical cooperation between the two bodies.

(340) The Committee recommended that an overarching theme for the proposed workshop might be: 'Opportunities for collaboration and practical cooperation between the CEP and SC-CAMLR'.

(341) The Committee further recommended that issues of common interest between the CEP and the SC-CAMLR might be used to focus discussions relating to the proposed workshop theme. Such issues of common interest might include, though may not be limited to:

- Climate change research
- Ecosystem and environmental monitoring
- Protected areas and spatial management measures
- Species requiring special protection
- Marine pollution
- Biodiversity and non-native species

(342) The aim would not be to address these issues in substantive detail, but rather to focus on the development of mechanisms for practical cooperation which may be specific to these issues.

(343) Although the timing of the workshop remains open for discussion, it could be conveniently scheduled immediately prior to CEP XII in Baltimore, US. The workshop

might follow a similar model to the two-day workshop on Antarctica's Future Environmental Challenges held in Edinburgh, UK, immediately prior to CEP IX.

(344) A workshop Steering Group comprising both CEP and SC-CAMLR Members should be convened as soon as is practical. The Committee agreed to nominate its Chair and two Vice chairs as representatives on the Steering Group. In developing a workshop agenda, this Steering Group might wish to consider the proposed workshop theme and issues of common interest outlined above.

(345) Pending the further development of an agenda and practical arrangements for the workshop, CEP Members were encouraged to consider the nomination of workshop participants to contribute to the issues outlined above.

(346) The Committee requested the CCAMLR observer to forward its recommendations on the proposed workshop to SC-CAMLR Members for their consideration. The Committee looked forward to working together with SC-CAMLR colleagues towards the convening of a joint workshop in 2009.

(347) The CEP Chair introduced to WP 23 *Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources Performance Review* (New Zealand) noting the Commission's decision to undertake a performance review of CCAMLR. In recognition of the important linkages between the ATCM and CCAMLR, the Commission had decided to invite the Chair of the CEP to participate in the Review, *ex officio*, as one of the panel members.

(348) The Chair noted that the performance criteria were appended to WP 28. A draft Resolution on the issue was also appended to WP 23. The CEP Chair welcomed Members providing him with comments and suggestions with respect to his involvement in the panel.

(349) Australia welcomed the CEP Chair's involvement in the review panel, noting that of the criteria set out for reviewing the performance of CCAMLR, matters related to environmental protection, conservation, protected areas, marine pollution and ecosystem approach were matters the Chair may wish to particularly concentrate on.

(350) The CCAMLR observer noted that the review panel would meet in Hobart 23 – 27 June 2008 and that the panel's report would go to CCAMLR XXVII in October of this year.

(351) The Chair welcomed SCAR's invitation for a CEP representative to attend the SCAR delegates meeting in Moscow (14-16 July 2008). The Committee thanked SCAR for this invitation and welcomed Hugo Declair's (Belgium) offer to represent the Committee at this meeting.

(352) The Chair provided a verbal report on his recent participation in a SCAR Action Group established to review and improve SCAR's advisory role to support the work of the CEP. The Chair noted that several recommendations to enhance this role had been agreed and that a more complete report would be provided to the CEP once the recommendations and findings had been considered by the SCAR delegates and its Executive.

(353) SCAR thanked the CEP Chair for his participation in the action group.

Item 15: General Matters

(354) No papers received.

Item 16: Election of Officers

(355) The meeting re-elected Dr Neil Gilbert (New Zealand) for a second term as Chair of the CEP and Ewan McIvor (Australia) for a first term as Second Vice Chair. Both were elected by acclamation. Dr Yves Frenot continues in his role as First Vice Chair.

(356) The Committee thanked Dr Tânia Brito (Brazil) for her involvement during the two last years in the CEP work as Vice Chair and congratulated Neil Gilbert and Ewan McIvor for their election.

Item 17: Preparation for CEP XII

(357) The Committee adopted the agenda for CEP XII in Appendix 2.

Item 18: Adoption of the Report

(358) The Committee adopted the draft Report.

Item 19: Closing of the Meeting

(359) The Chair closed the meeting on Friday 6 June 2008.

ANNEX 1

CEP XI Agenda and Final List of Documents

Paper N°	Title	Submitted by
----------	-------	--------------

Item 1: Opening of the Meeting**Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda****Item 3: Strategic Discussion on the Future of the CEP**

WP 17	Preparation for Scheduled CEP Discussions: Reviews of Past Activities	Australia
WP 29 rev.1	A Five-Year Work plan for the CEP: Report on Intersessional Review	New Zealand
WP 57	Report on Effectiveness of Trial Informal Group	Brazil

Item 4: Operation of the CEP

SP 3 rev.2	Secretariat Report 2007/08	Secretariat
SP 12	Electronic Information Exchange System	Secretariat
IP 14	Rapport annuel présenté par la France conformément à l'article 17 du Protocole au Traité sur l'Antarctique relatif à la protection de l'environnement 2008	France
IP 15	Informe Anual del Ecuador de acuerdo con el Artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre Protección del Medio Ambiente	Ecuador
IP 22	Annual Report Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Ukraine
IP 24	Annual Report Pursuant to the Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Japan
IP 25	Informe Anual de España de acuerdo con el Artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre Protección del Medio Ambiente	Spain
IP 34	Informe Anual de Acuerdo al Artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre la Protección del Medio Ambiente Periodo 2007 - 2008	Uruguay
IP 36	Annual Report pursuant to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Belgium
IP 42	Annual Report pursuant to Article 17 of The Protocol on Environmental Protection to The Antarctic Treaty	South Africa
IP 55	Report on the Implementation of the Protocol on Environmental Protection as Required by Article 17 of the Protocol	United Kingdom
IP 68	Annual Report of China Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	China
IP 71	Annual Report Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty 2007-2008	Italy
IP 90	Annual Report of New Zealand pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty 2007/2008	New Zealand
IP 96	Annual Report pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Peru

Paper N°	Title	Submitted by
----------	-------	--------------

Item 5: International Polar Year

IP 59	International Polar Year 2007-2008 Planning Document: 2008 and Beyond	SCAR
IP 88	Antarctic Treaty Summit: Science-Policy Interactions in International Governance	IPY-IPO
IP 125	South American Network on Antarctic Marine Biodiversity (BioMAntar)	Brazil

Item 6: Environmental Impact Assessment*6a) Draft comprehensive environmental evaluations*

WP 5	The Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation for the construction and operation of the Chinese Dome A Station in Antarctica	China
WP 15	Report of the Intersessional Open-ended Contact Group to Consider the Draft CEE for the "Proposed Construction and Operation of the New Chinese Research Station at Dome A"	Australia
IP 4	The Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation for the construction and operation of the Chinese Dome A Station in Antarctica	China
IP 77	Additional Information on draft CEE on proposed new Chinese Dome A Station in Antarctica	China

6b) Other EIA matters

WP 12	Human Disturbance to Wildlife in the Broader Antarctic Region: A Review of Findings	SCAR
WP 34	A Mechanism for Centralizing Tourism and Non-governmental Activity Declarations and Authorization Requests Suitable for Taking Cumulative Impacts into Account	France
WP 60	Quantifying Atmospheric Emissions in Antarctic Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations	United Kingdom
SP 8	Annual list of Initial Environmental Evaluations (IEE) and Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEE) prepared between April 1 st 2007 and March 31 st 2008	Secretariat
IP 1	Initial Environmental Evaluation Law-Racovita Base	Romania
IP 16	Update on the Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation of New Indian Research Base at Larsemann Hills, Antarctica	India
IP 26	Initial Environmental Evaluation for Installation of Earth Station at Maitri, Schirmacher Oasis, Antarctica	India
IP 41	A decade of Antarctic tourism: Status, change, and actions needed	ASOC
IP 44	Results of Russian studies of the subglacial Lake Vostok during the season 2007-2008	Russian Federation
IP 45	On obtainment of permit to authorize activities of the Russian Antarctic Expedition for the period from 2008 to 2012	Russian Federation
IP 49	Initial Environmental Evaluation for Installation of Wind Energy Generators (WEG) at Maitri, Schirmacher Oasis, Antarctica	India
IP 101	The ANDRILL Independent Environmental Audit	New Zealand and United Kingdom
IP 102	On the Issue of the Replacement of Fuel Tanks at Vernadsky Station	Ukraine
IP 105	Plan de Manejo Ambiental Estación Maldonado Ecuador	Ecuador
IP 124	Initial Environmental Evaluation "RMM-technology on recycling of solid food wastes at Ukrainian Antarctic Vernadsky station"	Ukraine

Paper N°	Title	Submitted by
----------	-------	--------------

Item 7: Area Protection and Management Plans

7a) Management plans

WP 3	Proposal for a new Antarctic Specially Protected Area at Nareški Point, Barton Peninsula, King George Island	Korea (ROK)
WP 7	Five Years Review of Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASP) N° 161 Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea	Italy
WP 8	Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 138 Linnaeus Terrace, Asgard Range, Victoria Land	United States
WP 9	Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 137, North-west White Island, McMurdo Sound	United States
WP 13	Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 106 Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea	United States
WP 14	Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 124 Cape Crozier, Ross Island	United States
WP 19	Revised Draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASP) Management Plan for Amanda Bay, Ingrid Christensen Coast, Princess Elizabeth Land, East Antarctica	Australia & China
WP 25 rev. 1	Review of Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASP) No.s 105, 118, 155, 154, and 156	New Zealand
WP 31	Review of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) 135, 143, 160	Australia
WP 32	Review of Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASP) No. 141	Japan
WP 37 rev. 1	Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 123 Barwick and Balham Valleys, Southern Victoria Land	United States
WP 39	Draft Management Plan for ASMA No. X: South-west Anvers Island and Palmer Basin	United States
WP 46 rev. 1	Revisión del Plan de Gestión de la Zona Antártica Especialmente Protegida N° 150 Isla Ardley, Bahía Maxwell, Isla Rey Jorge (Isla 25 De Mayo)	Chile
WP 47	Revisión del Plan de Gestión de la Zona Antártica Especialmente Protegida N° 125 Península Fildes, Isla Rey Jorge (Isla 25 de Mayo)	Chile
WP 52	Revised Draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area Management Plan For Mount Harding, Grove Mount, East Antarctic	China
WP 53	Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASP) Management Plan for Marion Nunataks, Charcot Island, Antarctic Peninsula	United Kingdom
WP 58	Review of Draft Management Plans by Trial Informal Group	Brazil
SP 6	Register of the Status of Antarctic Specially Protected Area and Antarctic Specially Managed Area Management Plans	Secretariat

7b) Historic sites and monuments

WP 61	Antarctic Protected Area System: Revised List of Historic Sites and Monuments - Measure 3 (2003). Guidelines for its Application	Chile
IP 12	Recuperación del Sitio Histórico N° 56 Base Aérea Antártica "Pde. Gabriel González Videla"	Chile

7c) Site guidelines

WP 2	Site Guidelines for Wordie House, Winter Island, Argentine Islands	Ukraine & United Kingdom
WP 12	Human Disturbance to Wildlife in the Broader Antarctic Region: A Review of Findings	SCAR
WP 40 rev.2	Site Guidelines for Shingle Cove, Coronation Island	United Kingdom
WP 44 rev. 1	Site Guidelines for Devil Island, Vega Island	United Kingdom
WP 45	Site Guidelines for Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea	United States
WP 56	Site Guidelines for Whalers Bay, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands	Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom and United States
WP 59	Guidelines for Half Moon Island, South Shetland Islands	Argentina
IP 6 rev. 1	Antarctic Site Inventory: 1994-2008	United States
IP 82	Update on the Antarctic Peninsula Landing Site Use and Site Guidelines	IAATO

Paper N°	Title	Submitted by
----------	-------	--------------

7d) *Systematic environmental geographic framework*

WP 27	Systematic Environmental Protection in Antarctica: Final report on Environmental Domains Analysis for the Antarctic continent as a dynamic model for a systematic environmental geographic framework for Annex V of the Protocol	New Zealand
-------	--	-------------

7e) *Other Annex V matters*

WP 41 rev. 1	Guidance for Working Papers on Area Protection and Management	United Kingdom
IP 2	Workshop on Bioregionalisation of the Southern Ocean (Brussels, Belgium, August 2007)	United Kingdom & United States
IP 3	Proposed approach for the identification of important marine areas for conservation	United Kingdom
IP 30	Final Report on the Research Project "Risk assessment for Fildes Peninsula and Ardley Island and the development of management plans for designation as Antarctic Specially Protected or Managed Areas"	Germany
IP 57	Area Protection: Time for Action	ASOC
IP 64	Grove Mountains, East Antarctica - between scientific research and environmental protection	Romania
IP 94	Ross Sea Heritage Conservation Project: Conservation of Shackleton's Hut, Cape Royds, ASPA 157	New Zealand
IP 109	Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station, South Pole Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA No. 5) First Year Management Report	United States
IP 110	Report on Exploration of Antarctic Subglacial Aquatic Environments: Environmental and Scientific Stewardship	United States
IP 117	The Admiralty Bay ASMA website	Brazil
IP 126	Report of the Deception Island Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) Management Group	Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom & United States

Item 8: Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna

8a) *Quarantine and non-native species*

WP 16	Antarctic Alien Species Database	Australia
IP 17	Measures to protect the Larsemann Hills, East Antarctica, from the introduction of non-native species	Australia, China, India, Romania & Russian Federation
IP 33	Medidas preventivas para evitar la introducción de especies alienas en la Antártida, en cumplimiento del Anexo II del Protocolo	Uruguay
IP 75	Non-native Species Incursions at Scott Base, Antarctica	New Zealand
IP 93	Non-native Species Awareness Campaign: "Don't Pack a Pest" When Traveling to Antarctica	United States
IP 98	Survey on existing procedures concerning introduction of non native species in Antarctica	COMNAP
IP 110	Report on Exploration of Antarctic Subglacial Aquatic Environments: Environmental and Scientific Stewardship	United States

Paper N°	Title	Submitted by
----------	-------	--------------

8b) *Specially protected species*

WP 10 rev. 1	Status of the Regional, Antarctic Population of the Southern Giant Petrel - Progress	SCAR
WP 30 rev.3	Draft Action Plan for Southern Giant Petrel <i>Macronectes giganteus</i>	New Zealand

8c) *Marine acoustics*

8d) *Other Annex II matters*

IP 21	Update on Wildlife Awareness Information for Aircraft Operations in Antarctica	United Kingdom
IP 107	Censos del Petrel Gigante del Sur <i>Macronectes giganteus</i> y las Skúas <i>Catharacta</i> spp en la Punta Fort Williams-Isla Greenwich y la Isla Barrientos, Shetland del Sur, Antártida	Ecuador

Item 9: Environmental Monitoring and Reporting

9a) *Climate change*

WP 35	Antarctic Climate Change Issues	Norway & United Kingdom
IP 23	Australia's Antarctic and Southern Ocean Climate Science	Australia
IP 50	Antarctic Peninsula: rapid warming in a pristine environment	United Kingdom
IP 51	Antarctic Peninsula: Ice shelf status	United Kingdom
IP 56	Impacts of Climate Change on Antarctic Ecosystems	ASOC
IP 62	Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment: A Progress Report	SCAR

9b) *Other environmental monitoring and reporting matters*

WP 24	Improving the CEP's Role in Advising the ATCM on the State of Antarctic Environments	New Zealand
WP 55	The Marine Biodiversity Information Network: 2010 and Beyond	Belgium
IP 7	Summary of Environmental Monitoring and Reporting Discussions	Australia
IP 35	Environmental Monitoring of the Indian Permanent Station-Maitri In Pursuant to the Article 17 of Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	India
IP 54	The Recovery of Drilling Fluid from a Deep Ice-core Drilling Site on James Ross Island, Antarctic Peninsula	United Kingdom and France
IP 97	Antarctic Persistent Organic Pollutants. Notes on a Request from the Stockholm Convention	Chile
IP 118	Brazilian contribution to the Monitoring Programme for the Admiralty Bay Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA N° 1)	Brazil
IP 122	Monitoring of Human Impacts at McMurdo Station, Antarctica	United States

Item 10: Inspection Reports

WP 26	A Proposed Checklist for Inspecting Specially Protected and Managed Areas in Antarctica	New Zealand, United Kingdom & United States
WP 54	Proposal to revise the inspection checklists contained in Resolution 5 (1995)	Argentina

Paper N°	Title	Submitted by
----------	-------	--------------

Item 11: Emergency Response and Contingency Planning

IP 91	The COMNAP Fuel Manual, incorporating revised guidelines for fuel handling and storage in Antarctica	COMNAP
-------	--	--------

Item 12: Waste Management

IP 80	Completion of a Four-year Campaign to Clean Up the Syowa Station Area	Japan
-------	---	-------

Item 13: Prevention of Marine Pollution

IP 58	Antarctic Shipping	ASOC
-------	--------------------	------

Item 14: Cooperation with Other Organisations

WP 23	Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources Performance Review	New Zealand
WP 28	Report of the CEP Observer to the twenty-sixth meeting of the Scientific Committee to CCAMLR, 22 to 26 October 2007	New Zealand
IP 127	COMNAP Report to ATCM XXXI	COMNAP

Item 15: General Matters**Item 16: Election of Officers****Item 17: Preparation for CEP XII****Item 18: Adoption of the Report****Item 19: Closing of the Meeting**

ANNEX 2

CEP Contact Points

Member Country	Contact Person	Email address
Argentina	Mariano Memolli Rodolfo Sánchez	mmemolli@dna.gov.ar rsanchez@dna.gov.ar
Australia	Ewan McIvor Michael Stoddart	ewan.mcivor@aad.gov.au michael.stoddart@aad.gov.au
Belgium	Alexandre de Lichtervelde	alexandre.delichtervelde@health.fgov.be
Brazil	Tânia Aparecida Silva Brito Haynee Trad Souza	tania.brito@mma.gov.br haymee@secirm.mar.mil.br
Bulgaria	Christo Pimpirev Nesho Chipev	polar@gea.uni-sofia.bg chipev@ecolab.bas.bg
Canada	Rita Cerruti	rita.cerutti@ec.gc.ca
Chile	Verónica Vallejos José Retamales	vvallejos@inach.cl jretamales@inach.cl
China	Wei Wen Liang Chen Danhong	chinare@263.net.cn hydane@vip.sina.com
Czech Republic	Zdenek Venera	venera@cgu.cz
Ecuador	Hernán Moreano Andrade	inae@gye.satnet.net
Finland	Outi Mähönen Mika Kalakoski	outi.mahonen@ymparisto.fi mika.kalakoski@fimr.fi
France	Yves Frenot Laurence Petitguillaume	yves.frenot@ipev.fr Laurence.petitguillaume@ecologie.gouv.fr
Germany	Heike Herata	Heike.herata@uba.de
Greece	Emmanouil Gounaris	giorgom1@otenet.gr
India	Shri Rasik Ravindra Anoop Tiwari	rasik@ncaor.org anooptiwari@ncaor.org
Italy	Sandro Torcini	sandro.torcini@casaccia.enea.it
Japan	Yusuke Saito	YUSUKE_SAITO@env.go.jp
Korea, Republic of	Beyng-young Son In-Young Ahn	iahn@kopri.re.kr
Netherlands	Gerie Jonk	gerie.jonk@minvrom.nl

Member Country	Contact Person	Email address
New Zealand	Neil Gilbert John (Harry) Keys	n.gilbert@antarcticanz.govt.nz hkeys@doc.govt.nz
Norway	Birgit Njaastad	njaastad@npolar.no
Peru	Fortunato Isasi-Cayo Patricia Gagliuffi	fisasi@ree.gob.pe pgagliuffi@ree.gob.pe
Poland	Andrzej Tatur Jakub T. Wolski	tatura@interia.pl jakub.wolski@msz.gov.pl
Romania	Teodor Gheroghe-Negoita	negoita_antarctic@yahoo.com
Russian Federation	Valery Lukin Victor Pomelov Anna Bystramovich	lukin@raexp.spb.su/lukin@aari.nw.ru pom@aari.nw.ru antarc@mcc.mecom.ru
South Africa	Henry Valentine Richard Skinner Carol Jacobs	hvalentine@deat.gov.za rskinner@deat.gov.za cjacobs@deat.gov.za
Spain	Manuel Catalán	cpe@mec.es / manuel.catalan@uca.es
Sweden	Olle Melander Marianne Lilliesköld	Olle.melander@polar.se marianne.lillieskold@naturvardsverket.se
Ukraine	Dr Valery Lytvynov Oleksandr Tashyrev	uac@uac.gov.ua tach@i.com.ua
United Kingdom	Rob Bowman Rachel Clark	rob.bowman@fco.gov.uk racl@bas.ac.uk
United States of America	Polly Penhale	ppenhale@nsf.gov
Uruguay	Aldo Felici	ambiente@iau.gub.uy

Observers 4a		
Observer	Contact person	Email address
Estonia	Mart Saarso	mart.saarso@antarktika.ee

Observers 4b		
Observer	Contact Person	Email address
CCAMLR		ccamlr@ccamlr.org
COMNAP	Antoine Guichard	sec@comnap.aq
SCAR	Colin Summerhayes Steven Chown	cps32@cam.ac.uk slchown@sun.ac.za

Observers 4c		
Observer	Contact Person	Email address
ASOC	Ricardo Roura James Barnes	ricardo.roura@worldonline.nl jimbo0628@mac.com
IAATO	Denise Landau Kim Crosbie	iaato@iaato.org kimcrosbie@iaato.org
IHO	Hugo Gorziglia	hgorziglia@ihb.mc
IUCN	Maj de Poorter	m.depoorter@auckland.ac.nz
UNEP	Christian Lambrechts	christian.lambrechts@unep.org
WMO	Alexandre Karpov	AKarpov@wmo.int

Appendix 1

Five Year Work plan for the CEP

Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the Interessional periods (subject to annual review)												
Issue / Environmental Pressure	Priority for CEP	Actions	Inters. period	CEP XII 2009	Inters. period	CEP XIII 2010	Inters. period	CEP XIV 2011	Inters. period	CEP XV 2012	Inters. period	CEP XVI 2013
Introduction of non-native species	1	1. Review Workshop recommendations 2. Develop practical guidelines / standards / norms for all Antarctic operators 3. Establish a database of non-native species occurrences in Antarctica 4. Review / endorse SCAR's RiSCC guidelines	Secretarial preparation of topic summary	Consideration of results of Alien in Antarctic IPY project Report by SCAR on workshop on minimising introduction of alien species Submission of information about measures taken by Parties Dedicated time for discussion	Workshop with SCAR and COMNAP or ICG established	Dedicated time for discussion						
			ICG established as required	If required, dedicated time for discussion								
Tourism and NGO activities	1	1. Provide advice to ATCM as requested										
Global Pressure: Climate change	1	1. Consider implications of climate change of management of Antarctic environment 2. SCAR currently undertaking a Review of Antarctic Climate and Environment		Standing sub-item SCAR report presented to CEP - dedicated time for discussion		Standing sub-item		Standing sub-item		Standing sub-item		Standing sub-item

Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the intersessional periods (subject to annual review)												
Issue / Environmental Pressure	Priority for CEP	Actions	CEP XII 2009		CEP XIII 2010		CEP XIV 2011		CEP XV 2012		CEP XVI 2013	
			Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period
Site specific guidelines for tourist-visited sites	2	1. Review site specific guidelines as required 2. Provide advice to ATCM as required		Assign to a Standing Group	Standing Group conducts work as required	SG report	Standing Group conducts work as required	SG report	Standing Group conducts work as required	SG report	Standing Group conducts work as required	SG report
			1. Refine the process for considering CEEs and advising the ATCM accordingly 2. Develop guidelines for assessing cumulative impacts 3. Keep the EIA Guidelines under review 4. Consider application of strategic environmental assessment in Antarctica	Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required	Consideration of ICG report on draft CEE, as required	Consideration of ICG report on draft CEE, as required	Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required	Consideration of ICG report on draft CEE, as required	Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required	Consideration of ICG report on draft CEE, as required	Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required	Consideration of ICG report on draft CEE, as required
Implementing and improving the EIA provisions of Annex 1	3			Consideration of ICG report on draft CEE, as required	Consideration of ICG report on draft CEE, as required	SG report	Standing Group conducts work as required	SG report	Standing Group conducts work as required	SG report	Standing Group conducts work as required	SG report
			1. Refine the process for considering CEEs and advising the ATCM accordingly 2. Develop guidelines for assessing cumulative impacts 3. Keep the EIA Guidelines under review 4. Consider application of strategic environmental assessment in Antarctica	Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required	Consideration of ICG report on draft CEE, as required	Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required	Consideration of ICG report on draft CEE, as required	Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required	Consideration of ICG report on draft CEE, as required	Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required	Consideration of ICG report on draft CEE, as required	Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required

		Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the Interseasonal periods (subject to annual review)										
Issue / Environmental Pressure	Priority for CEP	Actions	CEP XII 2009		CEP XIII 2010		CEP XIV 2011		CEP XV 2012		CEP XVI 2013	
			Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period		
Specially protected species	3	1. Consider listing / delisting proposals as they come forward	Forward SGP data and standard census methodology to ACAP for consideration	Consideration of advice from ACAP								
Overview of the protected areas system / SEGF	3	1. Apply the domains analysis (SEGF) to the existing system – undertake a gap analysis		SCAR report on fit of biological data Discuss possible implications of an updated gap analysis based on EDA	Assign to an area protection Standing Group							
Emergency response action and contingency planning	3	To be determined			COMNAP advice on ERA and CP requested		COMNAP report presented to CEP – dedicated time for discussion					

		Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the Intersessional periods (subject to annual review)										
Issue / Environmental Pressure	Priority for CEP	Actions	CEP XII 2009		CEP XIII 2010		CEP XIV 2011		CEP XV 2012		CEP XVI 2013	
			Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period	Inters. period		
Updating the Protocol and reviewing Annexes	3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complete review of Annex II (currently with the ATCM) 2. Prepare a prioritized timetable for the review of the remaining annexes. 		Requires CEP discussion on the need and aims for reviewing Protocol annexes.								
Inspections (Article 14 of the Protocol)	3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review inspection reports as required 2. Review environmental component of inspection checklists as required 	If required, ICG to review of Checklist A	Standing item Consideration of ICG report	Standing item	Standing item	Standing item	Standing item	Standing item	Standing item	Standing item	Standing item
Shipping Guidelines	4				Review status of IMO guidelines within IMO					Establish Expert Group to review guidelines		
Ballast water guidelines	4	1. Guidelines already approved by the ATCM. May need reviewing in due course			Review status of IMO guidelines within IMO					Establish Expert Group to review guidelines		

		Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the Interseasonal periods (subject to annual review)											
Issue / Environmental Pressure	Priority for CEP	Actions	Interseasonal period		Interseasonal period		Interseasonal period		Interseasonal period		Interseasonal period		
			CEP XII 2009	Interseasonal period 2010	CEP XIII 2010	Interseasonal period	CEP XIV 2011	Interseasonal period	CEP XV 2012	Interseasonal period		CEP XVI 2013	
Energy management	4	1. Develop best-practice guidelines for energy management at stations and bases						COMNAP report requested			COMNAP report presented to CEP – dedicated time for discussion		
Outreach and education	4	1. Review current examples and identify opportunities for greater education and outreach									Dedicated time for discussion		
Marine acoustics	5	1. Develop guidelines for use of noise-emitting devices 2. Maintain a watching brief on the issue									Report by Germany on marine acoustics risk assessment (para 261)		
Waste	5	1. Develop guidelines for best practice disposal of waste including human waste									COMNAP report requested		
Clean up of sites of past activity	5	1. Establish Antarctic-wide inventory of sites of past activity 2. Develop guidelines for best practice approach to clean up											Secretariat requested to develop COMNAP report on best practice requested

Appendix 2

CEP XII Provisional Agenda

1. Opening of the Meeting
2. Adoption of the Agenda
3. Strategic Discussions on the Future Work of the CEP
4. Operation of the CEP
5. International Polar Year
6. Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)
 - a. Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations
 - b. Other EIA Matters
7. Area Protection and Management Plans
 - a. Management Plans
 - b. Historic Sites and Monuments
 - c. Site Guidelines
 - d. Other Annex V Matters
8. Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna
 - a. Quarantine and Non-native Species
 - b. Specially Protected Species
 - c. Marine Acoustics
 - d. Other Annex II Matters
9. Environmental Monitoring and Reporting
 - a. Climate Change
 - b. Other Environmental Monitoring and Reporting Matters
10. Inspection Reports
11. Cooperation with Other Organisations
12. General Matters
13. Election of Officers
14. Preparation for Next Meeting
15. Adoption of the Report
16. Closing of the Meeting

Appendix 3

Subsidiary Group on Management Plans

Background

Since its first meeting in 1998, the CEP has discussed the need to improve its procedures for reviewing new and revised Management Plans. During this time, the CEP has adopted a documented process for its consideration of draft Antarctic Specially Protected Area Management Plans,¹ established individually convened informal intersessional contact groups for each draft Management Plan and established an online Discussion Forum to assist with intersessional work. The resource burden created by the large number of Management Plans under review each year will continue to be further considered within the context of the CEP's wider discussions on its five year work plan.

Benefits of establishing a Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP)

Under its Rules of Procedure, the CEP is able to establish formal subsidiary groups to assist with its work.² CEP X considered an Australian proposal to establish a coordinated intersessional process to review draft Management Plans, supported by a standing group, as a further improvement.³

CEP X agreed to establish a Trial Intersessional Group (TIG), considering the major benefits of establishing a TIG to be:

- improving the efficiency of CEP meetings by replacing detailed consideration of each draft Management Plan with consideration of the recommendations arising from a coordinated intersessional review (particularly with the increasing number of Management Plans falling due for a five-year review);
- promoting consistency between Management Plans through the TIG providing proponents with practical advice on the suitability of the Management Plan for the area in question, consistency with other Management Plans, and how the proposed Management Plan would contribute to the protected areas system as a whole; and
- improved participation by Members in intersessional work through utilising an experienced core group of participants while maintaining open membership of the group, achieving continuity and improved institutional knowledge.

Operation and outcome of the Trial Intersessional Group

The TIG was convened by Vice Chair Dr Tânia Britto of Brazil and operated remotely through the online Discussion Forum. Discussion took place in English, with the recommendations to proponents and report to the CEP translated through the Antarctic Treaty Secretariat to the four languages of the Antarctic Treaty. The TIG has reported to CEP XI that the trial was successful, and CEP XI considers that the appropriate next step is to formally establish a SGMP.

¹ Guidelines for CEP Consideration of New and Revised Draft Management Plans for Protected Areas (2000, and revised in 2003).

² Rule 10: The Committee may establish, with the approval of the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting, subsidiary bodies, as appropriate. Such subsidiary bodies shall operate on the basis of the Rules of Procedure of the Committee where applicable.

³ ATCM XXX WP 10 submitted by Australia.

Potential further activities for a SGMP

Other activities a SGMP could undertake as its resources allow include providing practical advice as requested to CEP Members who intend to prepare new draft Management Plans for the CEP's consideration, revising current guidelines and providing guidance to the CEP on how Management Plans can be made more consistent. This guidance could be used by CEP Members where Management Plans are reviewed with little or no changes made and are therefore not sent to the SGMP. The Terms of Reference (TOR) should be sufficiently broad to include such activities without the need for the CEP to continuously review the TOR.

Proposal for establishing a SGMP

Draft TOR are below for the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting's (ATCM) consideration. Matters important to the operation of the SGMP are also outlined below, along with the timeline for its operation⁴. It will be necessary to update the *Guidelines for CEP Consideration of New and Revised Draft ASPA and ASMA Management Plans* to reflect the establishment of the SGMP (see Annex 1).

Proposed Terms of Reference

- 1) Examine any draft new or revised Management Plan to consider, in consultation with relevant experts if appropriate:
 - whether it is consistent with the provisions of Annex V to the Protocol, particularly Articles 3, 4 and 5⁵, and with relevant CEP guidelines;⁶
 - its content, clarity, consistency and likely effectiveness;⁷
 - whether it clearly states the primary reason for designation;⁸ and
 - whether it clearly states how the proposed Area complements the Antarctic protected areas system as a whole.⁹
- 2) Advise proponents of suggested amendments to the draft Management Plan to address issues in relation to 1) above.
- 3) Submit a Working Paper to the CEP with recommendations for the adoption or otherwise of each new or revised draft Management Plan, identifying where the Plan reflects comments received by Members, and where they have not been, the reasons for not doing so. The Working Paper is to include all revised Management Plans and the information required by the ATCM's Legal and Institutional Working Group.
- 4) Provide advice to the CEP as necessary for the purpose of improving Management Plans and the process for their intersessional review.

Operational matters

- Translation: Under Rule 22 of the CEP Rules of Procedure, English, French, Russian and Spanish shall be the official languages of subsidiary bodies. The appropriateness of

⁴ CEP X Final Report, p259.

⁵ Modified from "Terms of Reference for an Intersessional Contact Group to Consider draft Management Plans" ToR #2 (CEP VII Final Report, Annex 4).

⁶ Currently including – for ASPAs – Resolution 2 (1998) *Guide for the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas*.

⁷ From "Guidelines for CEP Consideration of New and Revised Draft ASPA and ASMA Management Plans" paragraph 8 (CEP VI Final Report, Annex 4), and "Terms of Reference for an Intersessional Contact Group to Consider draft Management Plans" ToR #2 (CEP VII Final Report, Annex 4).

⁸ Agreement at CEP VIII (Final Report paragraph 187).

⁹ Agreement at CEP VIII (Final Report paragraph 187).

translation arrangements for subsidiary bodies needs to be considered on a case by case basis. Noting that the proposed SGMP will conduct its business remotely, the CEP considers that translation of the SGMP’s advice to proponents and to the CEP is sufficient to achieve compliance with Rule 22.

- **Membership:** While membership of the SGMP will remain open to all CEP Members, CEP Representatives are particularly encouraged to participate in the SGMP where they will be able to do so for several consecutive intersessional periods so as to achieve continuity in membership and improved institutional knowledge. The expectation is that all Members in the SGMP would participate in the review of all Plans except those they have proposed. The SGMP needs to maintain a minimum number (4) of participants to remain viable. The convener will have oversight of maintaining the membership of the SGMP.
- **Convener:** The convener of the SGMP may be either one of its elected Vice Chairs or a CEP Representative elected as convener under the same conditions as set out for the Vice Chairs in Rule 16 of the Rules of Procedure as applicable. The convener may, but is not required to, provide technical contribution to the SGMP’s activities.
- **Submission:** Revised draft Management Plans should be submitted to the SGMP at least 60 days prior to the meeting at which the Plan will be considered by the CEP.
- **Review:** The CEP intends to review the effectiveness of the SGMP after a 2 year period, and to revise the TOR as necessary.

Timeline

Period	Action	Timing
Intersessional period	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Antarctic Treaty Secretariat posts all draft Management Plans referred for intersessional discussion to the online Discussion Forum. 	As soon as possible following CEP meeting
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interested CEP Members and Observers post comments on draft Management Plans via the Discussion Forum. • Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP) considers draft Management Plans in accordance with its Terms of Reference and prepares a report with recommendations for proponents. SGMP report is translated and posted to the Discussion Forum. 	3-6 months following CEP meeting
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft Management Plans are revised by proponents in response to comments provided by Members, Observers and the SGMP, and posted to the Discussion Forum. 	60 days prior to CEP meeting
Working Paper deadline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SGMP convener submits Working Paper with recommendations for the adoption or otherwise of draft Management Plans. 	45 days prior to CEP meeting.
CEP meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration by CEP of Working Paper containing SGMP’s recommendations. 	

Appendix 3 - Annex 1

Guidelines for CEP Consideration of New and Revised Draft ASPA and ASMA Management Plans

1. Draft Management Plans (new or revised) shall be submitted by the proponent(s) to the CEP for consideration at its next meeting.
2. For those areas that include a marine component, and which meet the criteria set out in Decision 9 (2005)¹⁰, draft Management Plans shall also be forwarded by the proponent(s) to CCAMLR for its consideration.
 - The proponent(s) shall submit draft Management Plans to the CCAMLR Secretariat by mid-June to ensure that CCAMLR has adequate time to review the draft plans and provide comments within the timetable of the CEP's own review. Draft Management Plan(s) may be submitted to CCAMLR ahead of submission to the CEP depending on the timing of the CEP meeting in any one year.
3. At its meeting the CEP may, as appropriate, refer draft Management Plans to:
 - the ATCM for adoption; or
 - to the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP) for intersessional review.
4. In accordance with its Terms of Reference, the SGMP shall consider each draft Management Plan referred to it, advise the proponent(s) on recommended changes, consider any revised version of the Management Plan prepared during the intersessional period, and report to the CEP on its review.
5. With consideration of the recommendations of the SGMP, and any additional comments by Members, the CEP shall consider each Management Plan reviewed by the SGMP in accordance with paragraph 3 above.

¹⁰Decision 9 (2005) states that:

Draft management plans which require the approval of CCAMLR are those which include marine areas:

- In which there is actual harvesting of potential capability for harvesting of marine living resources which might be affected by the sites' designation; or
- For which there are provisions specific in a draft management plan which might prevent or restrict CCAMLR-related activities.

And that:

Proposals for ASPAs and ASMAs which might have implications for CCAMLR Ecosystem Monitoring Programme (CEMP) sites should be submitted to CCAMLR for its consideration before any decision is taken on the proposal.