

Report of the Committee for Environmental Protection

(CEP XIII)

Punta del Este, May 3 – 7, 2010

Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

- (1) The CEP Chair, Dr Neil Gilbert (New Zealand), opened the meeting on Monday 3 May 2010 and thanked Uruguay for arranging and hosting the meeting in Punta del Este.
- (2) On behalf of the Committee, the Chair warmly welcomed Monaco to membership of the CEP following its accession to the Environmental Protocol on 31 July 2009. Monaco's accession to the Protocol brings the number of Committee Members to 34.
- (3) The Chair summarised the work undertaken during the intersessional period as a result of actions and activities agreed at CEP XII, including an intersessional contact group (ICG) on non-native species, an ICG on general guidance for visitors to Antarctica, the CEP's tourism study and issues related to Area Protection and Management through the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP). In addition the Antarctic Treaty Parties had held two Antarctic Treaty Meetings of Experts. The Chair noted that the outcomes of these groups and meetings would be dealt with during the course of CEP XIII.

Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

- (4) The Committee adopted the following agenda and confirmed the allocation of papers to Agenda Items:
 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. Progress to the 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. Human footprint and wilderness values
 - e. Marine Spatial Protection and Management
 - f. Other Annex V Matters
 8. Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna

- a. Quarantine and Non-native Species
 - b. Specially Protected Species
 - c. 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
- (5) The Committee considered 48 Working Papers, 69 Information Papers and four Secretariat Papers (Annex 1).

Item 3: Strategic Discussions on the Future Work of the CEP

- (6) No Working Papers were submitted under this agenda item.
- (7) The Committee noted the utility of the Five-year Work Plan in prioritising its workload. The Committee agreed that the Five-year Work Plan should be reviewed and updated at the end of each meeting and, as well as being appended to the Report of CEP XIII, should be published on the CEP website, as well as being submitted to future CEP meetings as a Working Paper.
- (8) Australia noted that the ATCM intended to hold discussions on strategic planning and suggested that it would be useful to highlight the approach taken and lessons learned by the CEP in developing and implementing its work plan. The Committee agreed with this suggestion.

Advice to the ATCM

- (9) **The CEP highlighted the continuing value of its prioritised five-year work plan as an effective means of guiding its work and managing its workload, and encouraged the ATCM to draw on its experience in developing and implementing that plan, as appropriate, when considering a multi-year strategic plan for the ATCM.**
-
- (10) A number of Members drew attention to the significant number of papers submitted for consideration by CEP XIII and raised concerns about the limited time available to consider such a large number of papers. Several Parties suggested options to address the issue including:
 - urging Members to provide clear recommendations in their Working Papers;
 - limiting the amount of time spent on Information Papers during meetings, including time available for addressing individual Information Papers, and potentially having Information Papers available only in electronic format, and,
 - careful consideration as to how many ICGs can realistically be established in any one year.

- (11) The Committee agreed that this issue should be considered further in preparation for future meetings.

Item 4: Operation of the CEP

- (12) The Secretariat introduced SP 9 *Electronic Information Exchange System (EIES): Report on the 2nd operational season and summary information examples*, noting that 60% of the Parties had contributed information to the electronic information exchange system. The Secretariat noted that all technical changes to the EIES that had been proposed by Parties had been addressed to the extent that the suggested changes complied with Appendix 4 of the Final Report of ATCM XXIV and other relevant Measures. At the request of CEP XII, and following discussions at the ATCM XXXII, the Secretariat had developed two example data reports to demonstrate the utility of the EIES: one on Area Protection and Management and one on Ship Based Operations.
- (13) Several Members and ASOC thanked the Secretariat for its intersessional work on the EIES and for the illustrative report, noting that the EIES has potential to be an exceptionally useful tool to support the CEP's work.
- (14) However, it was noted by several Members that the utility of the EIES is dependent upon the extent to which the required data and information is provided by Parties. The Committee agreed that there is an urgent need to ensure that all Parties are fulfilling all information exchange requirements of the Treaty and Article 17 of the Environmental Protocol.
- (15) Following a suggestion by France the Secretariat agreed to issue a reminder in advance of deadlines for the submission of information, to facilitate improved use of the EIES.
- (16) ASOC noted that from a non-governmental organisation (NGO) perspective it was difficult to determine the extent to which the EIES was being used by Parties as the information could not be publicly accessed.
- (17) The Secretariat noted that individual Party reports against each of the Pre-season, Annual and Permanent information categories are made publicly available via the Secretariat website once submitted by the Parties.
- (18) Based on the conclusions of this document, Argentina suggested that it may be timely to review the information exchange requirements, in particular due to the fact that these were agreed before the Secretariat was established and the Electronic Information Exchange System was implemented.
- (19) Pertinent to the discussion, Germany introduced WP 41 *Antarctic Treaty Information Exchange via the Electronic Information Exchange System (EIES): Current state and improvements for a consistent use*, recommending that Members establish an ICG to review the success of the EIES with regard to utilization, standards of information exchange and availability of the advance notice according to Article VII (5).
- (20) Receiving no comment on the issue of reviewing the information exchange requirements, the Chair noted that WP 41 would be further considered by the ATCM. In concluding the discussions the Chair echoed comments from Members and strongly urged all Members to provide information to the EIES to ensure 100 per cent participation by ATCM XXXIV.
- (21) Other papers submitted under this Agenda item were:
- IP 72 *Annual Report Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (Ukraine)
 - IP 78 *Annual Report Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty* (Italy)
 - IP 127 *Informe Anual del Ecuador de acuerdo con el Artículo 17 del Protocolo al Tratado Antártico sobre Protección del Medio Ambiente- Expedición 2009-2010* (Ecuador)

- (22) The Chair reminded all Members that the submission of such Information Papers was no longer required given that submission of information to the EIES is now the preferred mechanism.
- (23) Chile proposed a revision to the election procedure for Vice-chairs noting that the most experienced Vice-chair, serving in their second two-year term, should automatically become the first Vice-chair, with the most recently elected Vice-chair assuming the role of second Vice-chair. This would mean that in the event of the first Vice-chair having to stand in for the Chair in his/her absence, the role would be assumed by the most experienced Vice-chair.
- (24) The Committee agreed with Chile's suggestion and proposed an amendment to Rule 15 of the Rules of Procedure of the CEP.

Advice to the ATCM

- (25) **The Committee reviewed a proposal for revised CEP Rules of Procedure and forwarded a revised version to the ATCM for consideration and adoption by means of a Decision.**
-

Item 5: Progress to the International Polar Year

- (26) Uruguay introduced WP 11 *Forwarding of hydrographic data collected during the IPY* and noted that with increasing maritime traffic, the value of collected hydrographic data during the IPY - through improved bathymetric surveying - for reasons of scientific research, environmental protection as well as maritime safety cannot be understated. Uruguay noted that it was essential for data collected by national programmes during the IPY to be made freely available as soon as possible to national hydrographic agencies. Uruguay offered a draft Resolution to this effect for consideration by the Committee.
- (27) Many Members as well as IAATO agreed that it was essential to ensure that all hydrographic and bathymetric data was made available for the purposes of improving maritime charts in Antarctic waters
- (28) SCAR agreed and noted the valuable contribution such data would also make to a Southern Ocean Observing System. SCAR noted that it has made several recommendations to its Members to ensure the collection and submission of hydrographic and bathymetric data.
- (29) Whilst agreeing in principle with the approach, the UK noted the importance of ensuring that submitted data was high quality data that could be used by charting agencies.
- (30) France also agreed with the principle, but with regard to the draft Resolution appended to WP 11, France and Argentina suggested that the forwarding of data should not be limited only to data collected during IPY, but should be an ongoing obligation of national operators and other vessel operators in Antarctica.
- (31) Australia noted the environmental benefits of collecting hydrographic data and adequate charting, as outlined in Resolution 5 (2008).
- (32) The Chair noted that WP 11 and the attached draft Resolution would be further considered by ATCM XXXIII.
- (33) SCAR introduced IP 50 *The Southern Ocean Observing System (SOOS)* noting that, despite the unique and critical role that the Southern Ocean plays in both driving global climate and supporting diverse biological communities, it has been poorly monitored. SCAR informed the Committee that the SOOS project is a partnership of several organisations (SCAR, SCOR, CAML, GOOS, WCRP, and POGO with involvement also from COMNAP and IAATO). SCAR noted that the project meets the requirements of ATCM Resolution 3 (2007), that it is one of the key recommendations from the Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment Report (Turner *et al.*,

2009), and that it is a significant legacy of IPY. Finally, SCAR noted that to succeed, a SOOS Secretariat will be required and requested support from the Parties for this initiative.

- (34) In response to a question SCAR clarified that the SOOS plan, once finalised, will be circulated to interested parties, and will be made available to the Committee at its next meeting.
- (35) Romania presented IP 99 *Young Scientists Fully Aware of the Importance of Antarctic Environment*, noting the education of students from more than ten countries with respect to climate change and general polar science.

Item 6: Environmental Impact Assessment

6a) Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations

- (36) No draft CEEs were circulated in advance of CEP XIII.
- (37) Russia introduced WP 59 *Answers to comments on CEE for "Water Sampling the Sub-glacial Lake Vostok."* The paper was presented in response to concerns raised during ATCM XXVI in Madrid, Spain, in 2003 (Appendix 2 to the Report of CEP VI refers).
- (38) Russia reminded the Committee of the history of the activity and the further drilling work that it had completed since the draft CEE had been circulated. Russia noted that some of the concerns raised by the Committee in 2003 could only be answered after resuming drilling in borehole 5G-1 in order to obtain new data on ice composition and structure above the sub-glacial lake. Drilling operations had recommenced in 2004, and by 28 October 2007, the borehole depth was 3668m. However a technical accident resulted in the loss of the drill at the bottom of the borehole. Attempts were made to extract the drill in the seasons of 2007-08 and 2008-09, but were unsuccessful. In January 2009 it was decided to bypass the accident segment by borehole deflection from the vertical. The deflection was started from a depth of 3590m, 1.5m from the accident segment. By late January 2010, the depth of borehole 5G-2 was 3650m.
- (39) Glaciological data obtained from this further drilling would allow Russia to respond to the concerns raised by the Committee. However, Russia noted that the drilling results needed for the completion of a final CEE had not been available in time for submission of the final CEE to CEP XIII. Russia anticipated finalising the CEE to allow it to circulate the document at CEP XIV.
- (40) Based on its experience and other ice drilling technologies used in Greenland and elsewhere in Antarctica, Russia informed the Committee that:
- Ice crystals in excess of 1.5m, with minimal inter-crystal spacing, suggest ice composition that is unlikely to result in drilling fluid spreading unpredictably throughout the ice. Such ice structure above the lake reduces the risk of contamination by drilling fluid at Lake Vostok. Drilling with a kerosene-freon mixture is likely to be the most environmentally "clean" drilling technique. Using similar technology, work undertaken on sub-glacial aquatic systems in Greenland suggests that frozen water that has risen upward in to the borehole is contaminated by drilling fluid only in the uppermost 10cm of the "fresh frozen" ice in the borehole. The lower layers of this Greenland core did not have any traces of contamination. Furthermore, this drilling fluid mixture is less dense than water and is hydrophobic, minimizing the risk of accidental contamination of lake waters. Thus, it seems to provide fewer environmental and logistical issues than several other methods that were evaluated.
 - A further alternative hot water drilling solution had also been assessed. However, this technology cannot be applied at Vostok Station, as the required power for a constant hot water circulation in the ice borehole with a temperature of about +90°C far exceeds what is available at Vostok Station.
 - Knowledge gaps noted in 2003 about the ice/water interface conditions and the chemical and microbiological composition of surface water of Lake Vostok had been the subject of assessment by Russia for the past 7 years. Data on the hydrochemical

properties of ice from the lower horizons of borehole 5G-1 had been presented at different international forums and published in scientific journals. Microbiological analyses of ice from the lower part of borehole 5G-1 showed the concentration of living cells to be low, comprising 1 to 10 cells in 1ml suggesting an extremely low biological activity in the surface water layer of Lake Vostok. These results had also been presented at different international forums and published in scientific journals.

- (41) The UK thanked Russia for this update noting the significant period of time since submission of the draft CEE in 2003. In finalising its CEE, the UK urged Russia to take account of new knowledge and information available since 2003 including the National Academy of Sciences study of sub-glacial aquatic systems and the soon to be published SCAR code of conduct on sub-glacial research. The UK also urged Russia to take account of the energy requirements of the drilling activity, which in its view should be standard considerations in all EIAs. The UK considers hot water drilling to be a clean technology that would afford protection to the sub-aquatic environment. The UK also urged all Parties to submit draft and final CEEs in a timely manner.
- (42) France thanked Russia for the information provided and noted its concern over the length restrictions on Working Papers. Such a restriction prevents the possibility to submit detailed information, which would have been more useful in a complex case such as this. In this context, France noted its interest in seeing further information in the final CEE, particularly on the suggestion that Lake Vostok is isolated from other sub-glacial aquatic systems. France congratulated Russia for exploring the possibility of drilling the ice at low pressure and encouraged Russia to undertake reliable and continuous monitoring of the pressure at the bottom of the borehole.

- (43) The United States thanked Russia for its paper and noted that it would welcome further dissemination of scientific information with regards to work from Lake Vostok thus far, in order that this knowledge may be applied to future drilling projects.
- (44) Germany congratulated Russia on the comprehensive work undertaken since 2003 and noted that the sampling of sub-glacial lakes in Antarctica was a big scientific goal.
- (45) Romania and India also congratulated Russia noting that any such activity had to balance environmental concerns against the scientific benefits.
- (46) India appreciated the technical expertise developed by Russia in the field of ice-core drilling and expressed that the project should be encouraged considering the scientific results expected.
- (47) SCAR responded to a question from Argentina about the current status of the SCAR code of conduct on sub-glacial lakes, commenting that environmental stewardship has always been a high priority for SCAR. Within SCAR there is a history of producing codes of conduct, which are produced by SCAR Members for SCAR Members. SCAR noted that these Codes of Conduct are guidelines only. The code of conduct for sub-glacial lakes has been reviewed by SCAR Members and national operators through COMNAP. The code of conduct for sub-glacial lakes has been put forward for approval by the SCAR delegates in August 2010 and, if approved, will be submitted as an IP to the next CEP meeting.
- (48) ASOC thanked Russia for the information it had provided. Expressing concern about the use and potential spillage of drilling fluids, ASOC encouraged the use of a precautionary approach in the continuation of the Lake Vostok drilling project. It requested confirmation from Russia that, to the extent possible based on the information available, the completion of the drilling into Lake Vostok would not result in the uncontrolled release of drilling fluid into the lake.
- (49) New Zealand thanked Russia for the update, and also noted the significant period of time that had elapsed since the circulation of the draft CEE. New Zealand, supported by the Netherlands and Germany, questioned whether such a time gap may merit re-circulation of an updated draft CEE for comment.
- (50) The Committee noted that neither the Protocol, nor its own operating guidelines currently made any provision on the time gap between circulation of a draft CEE and the final version.
- (51) Russia assured the CEP that it would fulfil the environmental impact assessment requirements of Annex I to the Protocol and that penetration of Lake Vostok would not take place until the final CEE had been submitted to the relevant Russian authorities for approval and circulated to the CEP.
- (52) India presented IP 6 *Update on the Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) of New Indian Research Station at Larsemann Hills, Antarctica* informing the Meeting that during 2009 and 2010 international meetings were held to finalize the design of the proposed new station and to discuss and define a strategy for transportation of various basic construction machines and for the development of an approach path from the landing site to the construction site at Larsemann Hills. India announced that basic construction equipment had been transported to the site over fast ice and an emergency shelter hut was placed at the site. It also informed the Committee that water and biological samples were collected from the site in order to monitor environmental impacts. India noted its plans to submit the final CEE by December 2010. The construction of the new station will commence in austral summer 2010/11.
- (53) Romania noted that it is important to keep the Larsemann Hills ASMA Management Plan in consideration in the further development of this project.

6b) Other EIA Matters

- (54) New Zealand introduced WP 1 *Chairs' Report - Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts on the Management of Ship-borne Tourism in the Antarctic Treaty Area*. New Zealand noted that the ATME, held in Wellington in December 2009, was a very successful meeting, attended by representatives of 19 Parties and six international organisations, and that a number of valuable

papers had been considered. New Zealand noted this meeting had been held to accelerate the Treaty Parties' consideration of the management of ship-borne tourism in Antarctica, not least to minimise the risks of a humanitarian and environmental disaster occurring in Antarctica as the result of a maritime casualty.

- (55) New Zealand noted that the ATME had considered a range of issues under the broad topics of maritime safety and environmental protection, and had agreed 17 recommendations for the ATCM to consider. New Zealand highlighted four of these recommendations that it considered of particular relevance to the CEP:

Issues related to Environmental Safeguards

- Recommendation 11: The meeting recommended that the relevant committees and groups of the ATCM (such as the CEP and the Operations Working Group) give further consideration to how assessment of the environmental aspects and impacts of Antarctic ship-borne tourism in ATME WP 8 (Appendix A to the ATME Report) could be drawn on to inform their discussions regarding the management of ship-borne tourism and shipping generally.
- Recommendation 12: The meeting recommended that Parties and those involved in non-governmental activities be encouraged to provide spatial and temporal data in support of future studies and syntheses for discussion by the CEP and ATCM.

Issues related to Emergency Response Action (Article 15 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty)

- Recommendation 13: The Treaty Parties should exchange information on contingency planning undertaken in fulfilment of Article 15, for responding to incidents with potential adverse impacts on the Antarctic environment.
- Recommendation 14: That the ATCM consider developing guidelines for responding to large-scale marine oil spills in the Antarctic Treaty area.

- (56) New Zealand noted that improved collaboration with the International Maritime Organization (IMO) had been a highlight of the ATME. New Zealand noted IMO's ongoing work in developing a mandatory Polar Shipping Code and that it had been asked to consider how the Code might be used to provide guidance on fuel spill response in the Antarctic Treaty area.
- (57) New Zealand noted that it would be submitting a paper on environmental issues including fuel spill response to the next meeting of IMO's Design and Equipment Sub-Committee (October 2010), within which the Polar Shipping Code was being developed.
- (58) In this regard New Zealand also intended to give further consideration to Recommendation 14 from the ATME and would provide a further paper on the matter to ATCM XXXIV.
- (59) The Committee, IAATO and ASOC thanked New Zealand for introducing the paper and offered congratulations for an excellent ATME.
- (60) With regard to Recommendation 12, the United States made note of its IP 2 *Spatial Patterns of Tour Ship Traffic in the Antarctic Peninsula Region* as an example of collaborative work with IAATO to report and analyse Antarctic maritime traffic. The United States noted the importance of such data to assess the efficacy of management, and that it would be happy to continue and expand such collaborations in the future to collect and assess spatial and temporal data.
- (61) IAATO echoed the comments of the United States noting the importance of collecting data from all maritime operators.
- (62) The United Kingdom expressed their continued commitment to work with the United States, IAATO and other organisations on data and information collection. The United Kingdom noted the importance of collecting data to facilitate a more complete picture of all maritime activities, both governmental and non-governmental.

- (63) In this regard COMNAP noted its existing ship position reporting system that includes both governmental and non-governmental participation and is used principally for search and rescue.
- (64) New Zealand also drew attention to the list of databases in WP 36 *Environmental Aspects and Impacts of Tourism and Non-governmental Activities in Antarctica: Project Report*, which had been compiled during the CEP's tourism study.
- (65) The Committee agreed that it would be important to continue to compile such data so as to support informed policy discussions and management decisions, though the collection, storage and management of such data represented a significant challenge.
- (66) With regard to Recommendations 13 and 14 from the ATME (WP 1), Chile and Argentina noted their longstanding cooperative agreements and joint naval patrols designed to provide a joint search and rescue response, including to environmental emergencies.
- (67) The UK also highlighted the importance of cooperation in such matters and noted that it frequently held joint oil spill response exercises as reported in IP 35 *Report of a Joint Oil Spill Exercise: RV Laurence M. Gould at Rothera Research Station*.
- (68) Argentina also recalled the significant work being undertaken by COMNAP to improve coordination on emergency response action and search and rescue including improved coordination among national Marine Rescue Coordination Centres in the framework of IMO. Any further work on these areas should take into account this framework.
- (69) Romania requested that ATMEs be numbered to reflect the number of ATMEs that have occurred on a given topic.
- (70) New Zealand observed that the Wellington ATME was the third over the past decade to consider aspects of shipping in Antarctica and reflected the ATCM's interest in the considerable expansion of ship-borne tourism in Antarctica including its concerns over incidents such as the sinking of the *M/S Explorer* in 2007.
- (71) New Zealand noted that the comments from Chile and Argentina provided an excellent example of maritime collaboration, and highlighted that the severe and extreme conditions in Antarctica would require broad coordination among multiple Parties in the event of a maritime incident. New Zealand noted the provisions of Article 15 of the Protocol and suggested the consideration of contingency plans could be a task taken up by the CEP.
- (72) COMNAP noted that its members had prepared guidelines for developing contingency plans and that many plans were lodged with the COMNAP Secretariat. Those plans are usually site-specific, so that further consideration was needed as to how national operators and Parties might respond in the event of a large-scale environmental emergency.
- (73) Argentina suggested that a CEP representative could attend the search and rescue workshops being held by COMNAP.
- (74) With regard to ATME Recommendation 11, Australia presented WP 28 *Environmental Aspects of Antarctic Ship-borne Tourism*, noting that it was a revised version of an Australian paper submitted to the ATME. The attachment provided an assessment of the ways in which ship-borne tourism can interact with the Antarctic environment, and which of those interactions are addressed in existing regulations and guidelines. Australia noted that an important next step would be to evaluate the significance of the identified interactions through a risk analysis. Consistent with ATME Recommendation 11, Australia welcomed discussion on this type of approach and on how the assessment could be drawn on to inform the CEP's work to understand and address the environmental aspects of ship-borne tourism and shipping generally.
- (75) The Committee, IAATO and ASOC thanked Australia for this comprehensive work.
- (76) The United States noted that this table might usefully be addressed to the CEP's ongoing tourism study.

- (77) New Zealand, supported by the UK, agreed with the United States' proposal and suggested that a risk assessment be undertaken on the basis of the table and that such a table might also be added as an appendix to the EIA guidelines.
- (78) ASOC noted the usefulness of WP 28 to further work in the CEP tourism study and elsewhere. ASOC noted that while all activities may contribute to cumulative impacts, it is important to isolate the impact of tourism as a way to assess and manage this activity.
- (79) The Committee agreed to consider the environmental aspects table appended to WP 28 within the ongoing tourism study with the suggestion that a risk assessment be undertaken on the various aspects identified in the table. The Committee also agreed to further consider how the environmental aspects table might be appended to the EIA guidelines.

Advice to the ATCM

- (80) **At the request of the ATCM, the Committee considered the Report of the ATME on ship-borne tourism, paying particular attention to Recommendations 11, 12, 13 and 14 in that Report.**
 - (81) **The Committee endorsed the assessment of environmental aspects of ship-borne tourism referred to in ATME Recommendation 11 (Attachment A to Working Paper 28 (Australia)) and agreed to refer it to the CEP's tourism study with a suggestion that it be expanded to identify the level of risk associated with the various environmental aspects.**
 - (82) **With regard to Recommendation 12, the Committee noted the range of data sets that were being prepared through its tourism study and will provide more information to the ATCM on this when presenting the study to ATCM XXXIV.**
 - (83) **With regard to Recommendations 13 and 14, the Committee noted the importance of cooperation among Parties and National Programs in attempting to develop contingency plans to respond to large scale marine environmental incidents, in fulfilment of Article 15 of the Protocol.**
-
- (84) New Zealand introduced WP 36 *Environmental Aspects and Impacts of Tourism and Non-governmental Activities in Antarctica: Project Report*. New Zealand recalled that CEP XII had accepted a proposal by Australia, France and New Zealand to undertake a comprehensive assessment of the environmental aspects and impacts of Antarctic tourism. The study was initiated in May 2009, and 12 Members, IAATO and ASOC indicated their desire to support the work through participation in the Project Management Group through the CEP Discussion Forum. In December 2009 a small workshop had been held in Christchurch, New Zealand, to review progress with the study and to identify the work still to be concluded.
 - (85) New Zealand indicated that excellent progress had been made with the study, but insufficient time was available ahead of CEP XIII to allow for completion. New Zealand noted that a draft of Part 1 of the study report, focussing on an analysis of the current status and observed trends of Antarctic tourism, was available on the CEP discussion forum. Part 2, which focuses on an assessment and discussion of potential environmental impacts resulting from tourism and non-governmental activities in the Antarctic, required further work and additional input, especially from scientists involved in impact-related research projects.
 - (86) New Zealand thanked the Project Management Group members for their support and expertise, and IAATO for its support and provision of data. New Zealand invited the views of the CEP on the progress made thus far and matters that should be included in Part 2 of the study. New Zealand noted it would be happy to continue to lead this project with the support of Project Management Group and anticipated submitting a full report to CEP XIV.

- (87) Many Members, IAATO and ASOC thanked New Zealand and the Project Management Group and other contributors for this progress report.
- (88) France highlighted the complexity of the issues and data on this topic, noting that while IAATO members are compliant with the request for data, there is a paucity of non-IAATO member data.
- (89) Romania echoed the comments of France, and noted the importance of ensuring the data sets listed in the paper could be further developed over time to allow for ongoing assessments of tourism impacts.
- (90) ASOC underlined the need to collect information on all forms of tourism activities. In response to a question from ASOC New Zealand noted that it did not have sufficient data to assess the proportion of non-IAATO member tourism in Antarctica.
- (91) Australia noted the considerable work undertaken to date, including the commencement of a range of useful discussions on better understanding the interactions between tourism and the Antarctic environment. It noted that the continuation and completion of this work would greatly assist the overall aim of providing a sound and objective basis for future discussions regarding the environmental management of Antarctic tourism.
- (92) The United States noted the importance of including other data and information so as to place tourism impacts in the broader context of a changing Antarctic environment. Such information might be derived from national research programmes, long-term data sets including CCAMLR's ecosystem monitoring programme and Oceanites' Antarctic Site Inventory project as reported in IP 26 *Antarctic Site Inventory: 1994-2010*.
- (93) Germany suggested that the EIES may be considered as a data management tool to facilitate and broaden the CEP's database on tourism activities.
- (94) The Committee noted the ongoing nature of this work and welcomed the support of other Members in providing data and information to support the study, particularly with regard to non-IAATO tourism activities, and broader environmental monitoring or research studies on tourism or human impacts in Antarctica. The Committee gratefully accepted New Zealand's offer to continue to lead the study.
- (95) The United States introduced WP 52 *Data Collection and Reporting on Yachting Activity in Antarctica* (United States and United Kingdom) noting that, in the framework of the tourism study being conducted by the CEP, considerable difficulties were encountered in collecting data on yachting activities in Antarctica. Gaps were most significant among non-IAATO related yachts. Such yachts likely account for a small proportion of operators in the Antarctic, but their impact may be substantial as in the case of the recent event at Wordie House. The United States noted that the list of vessels attached to the paper was far from exhaustive.
- (96) The United States recommended that, in addition to completing the table provided in WP 52 to the extent possible, Parties contribute additional relevant yacht information to the current CEP study.
- (97) Relevant information can be sent to Dr Neil Gilbert n.gilbert@antarcticanz.govt.nz who is coordinating the CEP tourism study.
- (98) Romania thanked the UK and US for their paper and emphasised the need to comply with such requests for data to ensure the tourism study is as complete as possible.
- (99) France echoed appreciation for this paper and noted its support for New Zealand's complementary work on the tourism study. France also noted that several vessels on the list attached to WP 52 are operating under the French flag and have not received approval from the French authorities.
- (100) The UK noted that this was not an exhaustive list and welcomed all efforts to complete the information. The UK also drew attention to its ongoing efforts to raise awareness among the UK yachting community about regulatory requirements in Antarctica, including training courses, and would be pleased to share such information with interested Parties.

- (101) The Russian Federation expressed gratitude to the authors of this document and noted the significant data gaps. Russia further noted gaps in effective national regulations and the regular use of flags of convenience among vessels operating in the Antarctic. To improve consistency among Parties, all authorising governments must have sound domestic regulations for control and monitoring of their operators.
- (102) Chile agreed that there was a particular problem in managing this type of vessel in Antarctica, and noted that it had submitted a paper to the ATCM on the issue of yachts travelling under flags of convenience.
- (103) ASOC thanked the UK and US and noted that while there appear to be limited data about yachts, there are records of all known yachts that sailed to the Antarctic up until the early 1990s in the academic literature, and furthermore noted that there are only a few gateway locations from where yachts would depart to the Antarctic and where they would normally be required to report their departure and the next port of call. With the help of Parties in gateway locations it would be possible to close the information gap about current yacht activity in Antarctica.
- (104) Argentina agreed with other delegations regarding the lack of data and the need for improved information, though noted that its monitoring efforts in Argentina have revealed that many vessels do not disclose their intentions to enter Antarctic waters. This may be intentional or due to a lack of understanding regarding requirements, permits, and necessary reporting.
- (105) IAATO agreed with Russia on the need for strong competent authority processes to regulate yachting and other NGO activities in Antarctica, and noted that the majority of non-IAATO operators which had gone through a strong competent authority process are responsible and well-prepared. IAATO drew attention to its IP 75 *Non-IAATO tourism and visitation in Antarctica*, noting its outreach efforts to inform non-IAATO operators on proper operating procedures in Antarctic waters. IAATO agreed with Argentina that many vessels travel undetected and unreported but hopes that through outreach efforts, such as described in IP 75, non-IAATO vessels will be reached and appropriately educated. IAATO noted that it would continue to report any violations by non-IAATO visitors to the appropriate national authorities.
- (106) France recommended that such violations be reported to the CEP and the ATCM and recalled that implementation of the existing regulations is the responsibility of the Parties.
- (107) Australia, France and the United Kingdom welcomed IAATO's outreach work and its support in providing data and reports on tourism activities and of possible infringements. All such information was highly valued.
- (108) Argentina reported that it has established a tourism observation programme that will place trained observers at key visitor sites in Antarctica. The programme will result in reliable data collection on tourist activities.
- (109) ASOC thanked IAATO and suggested that, with respect to collecting data about tourism behaviour, Parties rather than IAATO were primarily responsible to monitor the conduct of tourism and suggested that a simple format for standard reporting of tourism incidents could be agreed on so that anyone witnessing tourism related incidents could report them to national authorities.
- (110) ASOC introduced IP 79 *Tourism and Land-based Facilities in Antarctica: Analysis of a Questionnaire Distributed to Antarctic Treaty Parties at XXXII ATCM* that summarizes the results of a questionnaire on tourism use of land-based facilities operated by Antarctic Treaty Parties distributed at ATCM XXXII, which had a response rate of c. 25% among Parties. The respondents were representative of all Antarctic Treaty Parties that run facilities in all parts of the Antarctic region. None of the respondents provides any support to tourism other than free basic hospitality. Most respondents opposed the notion of Parties being involved in tourism operations.
- (111) ASOC noted that no Party reported being aware of land-based facilities from other Parties that were used for tourism purposes in their area of operations. Two of the eight respondents indicated that one or more National Antarctic Programs (other than the respondents) possibly transport

and/or accommodate tourists, which is consistent with some observations made in the official inspection reports presented under agenda item 10. These activities might have an environmental impact that is not necessarily considered in for example EIAs or in the CEP tourism study. ASOC requested the Parties that have not yet done so to respond to the questionnaire attached to IP 79.

- (112) The United Kingdom presented WP 12 *Guidelines on Minimising the Impact of Pollution by Light at Antarctic Stations and Ships* noting that pollution by light is recognized as an environmental concern, which can result in loss of scientific data and mortality of seabirds, but that there was no Treaty-wide endorsed procedure for controlling light pollution from bases and vessels. In addition, whilst stations in the Antarctic clearly require outdoor lighting for safety reasons, light pollution mitigation procedures are not consistently adopted.
- (113) The United Kingdom had developed and implemented the proposed guidelines for use within its own operations to minimize the impacts of light pollution and the guidelines were recognised as an example of best practice by the British Astronomical Association. The UK also drew attention to its web-based bird strike log and indicated that it would be willing to share the software with interested Parties. The UK suggested that the Committee consider developing a single set of guidelines for wider use in Antarctica, perhaps by integrating similar guidelines from other Parties.
- (114) IAATO presented IP 24 *IAATO Guidelines to Minimize Seabirds Landing on Ships*. IAATO reported that it had developed these guidelines, primarily for sub-Antarctic waters, working with Birdlife International and that bird strikes by tour vessels had been reduced as a result of their implementation. IAATO would welcome any comment on the guidelines from the Committee.
- (115) South Africa, France, Ecuador, Australia, and Germany offered their support for the United Kingdom's proposal and indicated that they would be willing to participate in further discussions towards the development of a single set of guidelines for adoption at the ATCM.
- (116) Argentina noted that it had not encountered any bird strike on its stations or ships, though it did try and reduce external lighting as much as possible. Argentina suggested further scientific study might be required to assess the extent of the problem, and perhaps Parties may simply chose to implement the suggested guidelines if they wish to do so.
- (117) Whilst supporting the principle of minimising bird strike and pollution from artificial light, COMNAP noted the importance of not compromising safety on stations and ships and noted that light pollution was often managed by the need to reduce energy use and to protect scientific values.
- (118) India questioned what data might be available to characterise the extent of the problem.
- (119) The UK noted that it had collected two years of data through its web-based bird strike log.
- (120) The Committee thanked UK for its initiative. The Committee recognized that these guidelines can be useful and invited Parties to voluntarily test or implement them through their National Programmes and to consider gathering bird strike data to allow for further consideration of the issue.
- (121) IAATO presented IP 25 *IAATO Online Field Staff Assessment & Logbook* on the initiatives it had taken to improve field staff training. IAATO noted that during the past two years it prepared the IAATO Field Operations Manual (FOM), the IAATO Expedition Staff Logbook and that it had also established an online field staff assessment scheme designed to augment the training and test the knowledge of field staff on the contents of the FOM. IAATO also noted that the online assessment scheme will be rolled out for the 2010/11 season where initially all ship based Expedition Leaders will be asked to take part.
- (122) Argentina emphasised the importance of such efforts and that they be performed in other languages as well as English, offering to help in translation of materials. IAATO welcomed this offer.
- (123) The Republic of Korea presented IP 54 *The Republic of Korea's contribution to Antarctic science by installing a new permanent station in Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea* reminding the Committee that

in 2006 the Korean government had announced a plan to build a new research station in the Antarctic in order to enhance the Republic of Korea's scientific and collaborative capabilities in Antarctica. The Republic of Korea informed the Committee that, after visiting ten candidate sites, Terra Nova Bay, Northern Victoria Land, was considered the most suitable place to build the new station and to undertake a range of atmospheric, marine and climate change related research in the Pacific Ocean sector of Antarctica.

- (124) The Republic of Korea reported that its new station would embrace modern energy efficiency standards and provide 3,000m² of floor space for scientists and support staff. With the establishment of the new research station the Republic of Korea looked forward to making a significant contribution to international scientific collaboration and the effective management and conservation of the Antarctic environment. A draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) for the new station is to be prepared and circulated in advance of CEP XIV.
- (125) In response to an inquiry by the Netherlands as to the need for a new station as opposed to working through existing stations, the Republic of Korea explained that its proposal for a year-round station will allow for greater monitoring of climate change in this area, where year-round data are not currently collected.
- (126) Italy congratulated the Republic of Korea for the interesting presentation on its new base in Terra Nova Bay and welcomed Korean colleagues in relation to the scientific and logistic collaboration at the Italian base Mario Zucchelli. Italy is ready to work with Korean scientists on environmental and ecological issues and on the Italian proposal on marine protected areas that is in advanced study in the Ross Sea area.
- (127) Many Parties congratulated the Republic of Korea on its proposed new research station and recognized the valuable scientific contribution that the station will make for Antarctic ecology, geophysics and geology, marine science and climate change research.
- (128) Japan welcomed the initiative of the Republic of Korea to install a new wintering station at Terra Nova Bay area. The year-round station will be indispensable to monitor climate change, especially in the atmosphere and ocean, on the Pacific side of the Antarctic.
- (129) Germany, supported by the US, noted that the new Korean research and resupply vessel *Araon* may need to frequently travel through the Bellingshausen Sea area if transiting between the two Korean bases. It highlighted the unique opportunity presented to the Republic of Korea in conducting marine science while transiting the Bellingshausen and Amundsen Seas with its icebreaker.
- (130) Australia welcomed the Republic of Korea's advice regarding its plans for the new station and its intention to bring forward an appropriate environmental impact assessment to CEP XIV. Australia noted that it has developed a decadal science strategy, and would welcome discussion with the Republic of Korea and others on science cooperation, particularly with respect to climate science and oceanography.
- (131) Romania also congratulated the Republic of Korea and recognized the important science contribution the new station would make, though Romania wondered if the proposed size of the station exceeded its capacity needs.
- (132) The Committee looked forward to receiving the draft CEE during the intersessional period, noting that this would trigger its procedures for intersessional consideration of draft CEEs.
- (133) In presenting IP 63, *Preliminary Plan for Installation and Operation of the PANSY Atmospheric Radar System at Syowa Station*, Japan informed the Committee that, in order to improve understanding of the atmospheric system from the surface up to 500km and to contribute to improving the global atmospheric model for better forecasting the future global climate, it will install a large radar system at Syowa Station and operate for at least 12 years. Japan noted that, after completion of observations, this antenna system and associated facilities will be removed and the environment will be restored to its original condition. Japan announced that the Initial

Environmental Evaluation document for this proposed activity will be submitted to the Japanese authorities for assessment this year.

- (134) Germany presented IP 13 *Continued operation of Kohlen Base as a summer base in Dronning Maud Land including maintenance of a lab in the deep ice by the Alfred Wegener Institute* focusing on the permit, which has now been issued. In line with Article 2, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph d) of Annex III to the Protocol of Environmental Protection, the Federal Environment Agency of Germany (UBA) concluded that the drilling liquid and densifier are wastes which have to be removed from the Antarctic as soon as the activities are finished. Germany noted that here are two problems: on the one hand, there is no alternative to the used drilling liquid and on the other hand, there is no tested technology to remove the drilling liquid from the drilling hole. Therefore, the new permit stipulates that the Alfred Wegener Institute (AWI) must investigate possible technologies for the removal of such drilling liquid. As soon as such technology has been identified, the AWI is obliged to remove the drilling liquid. Since use and continuance of the used drilling liquid Exxol® D40 (pure kerosene) and of the densifier (HCFC 141b) in the Antarctic are still controversial, the paper was intended to stimulate a debate on possible ways of developing reasonable alternatives to this drilling liquid and of developing and testing technologies for the complete removal of drilling liquids from the Antarctic.
- (135) On the issue of drilling fluid removal from ice boreholes, the United Kingdom agreed with Germany on the need to debate the use of drill fluids and recalled that certain technologies already exist, as presented in IP 54 at CEP XI.
- (136) Other papers submitted under this Agenda item were:
- IP 1 *Initial Environmental Evaluation for Development of Approach Path at Proposed New Indian Research Station at Larsemann Hills, East Antarctica* (India)
 - IP 104 *An Environmental Management System for the Brazilian Antarctic Station "Comandante Ferraz" (Brazil)*
 - IP 122 *Informe preliminar del Estudio de Impacto Ambiental ex – post de la Estación Científica Pedro Vicente Maldonado (Ecuador)*
 - SP 11 *Annual List of Initial Environmental Evaluations (IEE) and Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEE) prepared between April 1st 2009 and March 31st 2010*

Item 7: Area Protection and Management

7a) Management Plans

i. Draft management plans which had been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans

- (137) In its capacity as convenor of the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP), Australia introduced WP 58 *Subsidiary Group on Management Plans – Report on Terms of Reference #1 to #3: Review of Draft Management Plans*. It noted that during the 2009/10 intersessional period the SGMP had included nineteen participants who communicated via the CEP Discussion Forum and email. Australia thanked all participants for their hard work.
- (138) Australia noted that no draft management plans submitted to CEP XII were referred for intersessional review during the 2009/10 intersessional period, but the SGMP had continued its review coordinated by the United Kingdom of the draft management plan for ASPA 106: Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea, which had been referred by CEP XI for intersessional review. In response to the SGMP's initial comments in March 2008, the United States had undertaken further fieldwork during the 2009/10 season, and had forwarded a revised version of the management plan to the SGMP.
- (139) The SGMP recognised the significant amount of work undertaken by the United States to revise the management plan, as described in IP 59 *Review of management plans under the Protocol: an*

example at Cape Hallett. In considering the revised plan, the SGMP had sought further clarification from the proponent on a small number of issues, including in relation to: whether the Area boundary could be modified slightly to allow safe and environmentally sensitive access by visitors to adjacent areas outside the ASPA; possible biosecurity issues arising from the presence within the Area of a frozen body of a dog; possible benefits of adding a marine component to the ASPA to protect foraging areas used by the penguin colony; and the basis for allowing poultry products to be taken (but not released) into Area. The United States had provided a written response to the SGMP's comments, together with a further revision to the draft management plan.

- (140) Australia informed the Committee that the SGMP had concluded that the issues raised during its reviews of the draft management plan had been adequately addressed by the proponent. Accordingly, the SGMP suggested that the CEP approves the revised Management Plan for ASPA 106.
- (141) The Committee endorsed the SGMP's recommendation and agreed to forward the revised management plan for ASPA 106 (Cape Hallett) to the ATCM for adoption.
- (142) The Committee also congratulated the United States on the thoroughness of the review process for the management plan, as outlined in IP 59.
- (143) New Zealand thanked the SGMP for its extensive intersessional work and noted that the reduced time required in Committee to address management plans demonstrated the efficacy and key role of the SGMP.

ii. Draft revised management plans which had not been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans

- (144) The Committee considered revised management plans for the following Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) and Antarctic Specially Managed Areas (ASMAs) under this category:
- WP 18 *Revision of maps and text for the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Managed Area No. 7: Southwest Anvers Island and Palmer Basin* (United States)
 - WP 19 rev. 1 *Revised Management Plan for ASPA No. 119 Davis Valley and Forlidas Pond, Dufek Massif, Pensacola Mountains* (United States)
 - WP 27 *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 139 Biscoe Point, Anvers Island, Palmer Archipelago* (United States)
 - WP 31 *Revision of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 105: Beaufort Island, Ross Sea* (New Zealand)
 - WP 32 *Revision of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 155: Cape Evans, Ross Island* (New Zealand)
 - WP 33 *Revision of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 157: Backdoor Bay, Cape Royds, Ross Island* (New Zealand)
 - WP 34 *Revision of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 158: Hut Point, Ross Island* (New Zealand)
 - WP 35 *Revision of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 159: Cape Adare, Borchgrevink Coast* (New Zealand)
 - WP 38 *Review of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) 101, 102, 103 and 164* (Australia)
 - WP 43 *Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 126 Byers Peninsula, Livingston Island, South Shetland Islands* (United Kingdom, Chile and Spain)
 - WP 55 *Review of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 163: Dakshin Gangotri Glacier, Dronning Maud land* (India)

- (145) In introducing its revised management plans for ASMA 7, ASPA 139, and ASPA 119, the United States noted that:
- substantial increases in number of breeding pairs of gentoo penguins on Biscoe Point had necessitated the inclusion of a Helicopter Access Zone for ASPA 139 (Biscoe Point), with consequent changes to a map in the management plan for ASMA 7 (Southwest Anvers Island and Palmer Basin);
 - the management plan for ASPA 119 (Davis Valley and Forlidas Pond) had been updated with input from the Russian Federation and United Kingdom. A notable change was the inclusion of a provision to allow visits to the Area for compelling educational reasons; and
 - other minor changes to the text and maps of these plans were outlined in the corresponding Working Papers.
- (146) In response to a query from ASOC, the United States advised that educational visits would allow the outstanding features of the Area to be documented for the purpose of informing a wider audience about the Area and its value in the global context. It had no plans at present for such an expedition, but in its view the potential for limited and strictly controlled visits for these purposes should not be prohibited in the future.
- (147) In presenting the revised management plans for ASPA 105 (Beaufort Island), ASPA 155 (Cape Evans), ASPA 157 (Backdoor Bay), ASPA 158 (Hut Point), and ASPA 159 (Cape Adare) New Zealand noted that:
- the fast ice portion of the boundary to ASPA 105 had been revised and enlarged to account for the movement of the breeding area of emperor penguins; and
 - minor modifications had been made to promote consistency between the management plans for the four ASPAs in the Ross Sea region which are designated to protect heroic era historic huts.
- (148) The United Kingdom endorsed the proposed revisions to the management plans for ASPAs 155, 157, 158 and 159 and noted its strong interest in these Areas, given that all of these historic huts were associated with previous British expeditions.
- (149) In presenting the revised management plans for ASPAs 101 (Taylor Rookery), 102 (Rookery Islands), 103 (Ardery Island and Odber Island), and 164 (Scullin and Murray Monoliths), Australia noted that:
- only minor amendments to each of the management plans were required; and
 - the provisions of the management plan for ASPA 102 had been modified to encourage the conduct of a census at the Giganteus Island southern giant petrel colony (situated within a Restricted Zone) at least once every five years, consistent with the recommendations arising from Resolution 5 (2009) on Protection of the Southern Giant Petrel.
- (150) In presenting the revised management plan for ASPA 163 (Dakshin Gangotri Glacier), India noted that few observational visits had been made to the Area since its designation in 2005, and no significant changes had been introduced to the management plan.
- (151) On behalf of the co-authors of WP 43, the United Kingdom noted that, following a visit to the Area in January 2010, the management plan for ASPA 126 (Byers Peninsula) had been revised and updated. Substantive changes included:
- the addition of Spain as a co-sponsor;
 - the establishment of an International Coordination Committee to oversee implementation of the management plan;

- a requirement that no more than twelve people can be in the Area at any one time, due to the environmental sensitivity of the Area;
 - redefining the boundary of the Area such that newly exposed ice-free ground resulting from the retreat of Rotch Dome would automatically be considered within the ASPA;
 - the designation of Ray Promontory and recently de-glaciated areas along Rotch Dome ice front as restricted areas.
- (152) The Committee agreed with the proponents' proposal that this draft revised management plan should be referred to the SGMP for intersessional review.
- (153) The Committee agreed to refer all other revised management plans to the ATCM for adoption.

iii. New draft management plans for protected/managed areas

- (154) There were no draft management plans submitted for proposed new ASPAs or ASMA.

Advice to the ATCM

- (155) **The Committee had before it 15 revised protected or managed area management plans. One of these had been subject to review by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP) and 14 revised management plans had been submitted directly to CEP XIII.**
- (156) **In reviewing the advice of the SGMP, and following the Committee's assessment of those plans that had not been subject to intersessional review, the Committee agreed to forward the following 14 management plans to the ATCM for adoption:**

#	Name
ASMA 7	Southwest Anvers Island & Palmer Basin
ASPA 101	Taylor Rookery, Mac.Robertson Land
ASPA 102	Rookery Islands, Holme Bay, Mac.Robertson Land
ASPA 103	Ardery Island and Odbert Island, Budd Coast
ASPA 105	Beaufort Island, McMurdo Sound, Ross Sea
ASPA 106	Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea
ASPA 119	Davis Valley and Forlidas Pond, Dufek Massif, Pensacola Mountains
ASPA 139	Biscoe Point, Anvers Island, Palmer Archipelago
ASPA 155	Cape Evans, Ross Island
ASPA 157	Backdoor Bay, Cape Royds, Ross Island
ASPA 158	Hut Point, Ross Island
ASPA 159	Cape Adare, Borchgrevink Coast
ASPA 163	Dakshin Gangotri Glacier, Dronning Maud Land
ASPA 164	Scullin and Murray Monoliths, Mac.Robertson Land, East Antarctica

- (157) **Noting that substantial changes were proposed to the management plan for ASPA 126 Byers Peninsula, the Committee decided to refer the management plan to the SGMP for intersessional review.**

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

- (158) As convener of the SGMP, Australia introduced WP 30 *Subsidiary Group on Management Plans – Report on Term of Reference #4: Improving Management Plans and the Process for their Intersessional Review*. Australia noted that during the 2009/10 intersessional period the SGMP had addressed the tasks outlined in the work plan agreed by CEP XII.

- (159) The Committee considered the draft suggested standard wording and template for ASPA management plans developed by the SGMP and presented in Attachment A to WP 30. These products were intended to promote consistency between management plans. The SGMP had again emphasised the need for management plans to contain sufficient details about the special features of the area in question and requirements for access and management, to ensure that people planning visits and national authorities responsible for issuing permits are able to do so in a manner consistent with the purpose for designation. Accordingly, the suggested standard wording and template were not intended to discourage proponents from developing and implementing site-specific or creative and innovative approaches to area protection and management.
- (160) The Committee noted that the SGMP had considered but did not reach a conclusion on the suitability of standard wording regarding taking poultry products into ASPAs. The Chair recalled that this issue had been raised in past meetings though never resolved. The Committee encouraged Members to seek further advice on this topic and provide advice to the SGMP or CEP as appropriate.
- (161) Emphasising the importance of ensuring that the process for developing management plans does not become automated, the Committee endorsed the SGMP's proposal that the standard wording and template be completed and incorporated into a revised version of the *Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas* (the Guide), which the SGMP would prepare during the 2010/11 intersessional period.
- (162) The Committee next considered the SGMP's work coordinated by Norway on developing an approach to reviewing management plans not referred by the CEP for intersessional review. It was noted that the CEP had established a functional manner in which to review ASPA and ASMA management plans before adopting them, utilizing the function of the SGMP in that process. However, certain types of plans may not be subject to consideration by the SGMP, including:
- Type 1: Management plans in Annex V format that were adopted before the SGMP was established and which undergo such small changes (or none) during the five-year review and that the CEP advises the ATCM to adopt directly.
 - Type 2: Management plans in Annex V format that are overdue for five-yearly review. Likely there is a process underway for the review of many of these management plans that may be delayed for various reasons, but some of these may not reappear in front of the CEP for a number of years.
 - Type 3: Management plans in Annex V format that have undergone the five-yearly review, but have been determined by the proponent to not require revision, and thereby not put in front of the CEP for consideration.
 - Type 4: Management plans that have not yet been adopted in Annex V format.
- (163) The Committee agreed with the SGMP's recommendations on:
- establishing a long-term goal of ensuring that all ASPA and ASMA management plans contain adequate content, and are clear, consistent, and likely to be effective;
 - adding an additional Term of Reference to provide a basis for the SGMP to suggest mechanisms for achieving this goal, as follows: *'Develop and suggest procedures that would assist in achieving a long-term goal aiming at ensuring that all ASPA and ASMA management plans contain adequate content, and are clear, consistent and likely to be effective'*; and
 - agreeing that the SGMP should invite those Parties responsible for Type 2, 3 and 4 plans to provide information about the review status and timeframe, as a basis for further prioritisation.
- (164) Noting that there are currently no guidelines for the preparation of ASMA management plans, the SGMP also brought forward a proposal by the United Kingdom suggesting that it would be useful

to exchange best practice and produce guidelines for preparing management plans, perhaps by convening an ASMA workshop.

- (165) The United States noted the importance of holding this workshop as soon as practical, due to the fact that three ASMA management plans are to be revised within the next two years.
- (166) The Committee endorsed the idea of an ASMA workshop and noted that it remained necessary to identify a suitable date and venue for such a workshop, as well as options for funding the attendance of experts. In that respect, the Committee warmly welcomed an offer by Uruguay to host a workshop prior to CEP XIV, but noted that further discussions with the hosts of CEP XIV (Argentina) would take place during the intersessional period before any arrangements for a workshop could be finalised. The Committee noted that the objectives and themes identified in section 6 of WP 30 would provide a good basis for such a workshop.
- (167) As agreed at ATCM XXXI (2008), the Committee reviewed the effectiveness of the SGMP over the previous two-year period and the suitability of its suggested work plan for the 2010/11 intersessional period. It agreed that the SGMP had been highly effective in advising the CEP on the matters addressed in the group's Terms of Reference and that, as discussed earlier, the group's Terms of Reference should be expanded to include the function of providing advice on achieving the long-term goal of ensuring that all ASPA and ASMA management plans contain adequate content, and are clear, consistent and likely to be effective (Appendix 1).
- (168) The Committee noted that several papers presented to the meeting raised issues that would be worth considering in the SGMP's work to review the Guide and, accordingly, endorsed a modified version of the forward work plan appended to WP 30 (Appendix 2).
- (169) The Committee looked forward to receiving the outputs of the SGMP's future activities, and thanked Mr McIvor from Australia for his ongoing work to coordinate the SGMP.

Advice to the ATCM

- (170) **The Committee considered the report from the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP) on its work, in accordance with its fourth Term of Reference, to improve management plans and the process for their intersessional review.**
- (171) **In accordance with a commitment made at CEP XI (2008), the CEP reviewed the effectiveness of the SGMP and agreed that the group had been highly effective in providing advice on management plans referred for intersessional review and on improvements to management plans more generally and the process for their intersessional review.**
- (172) **The Committee adopted a long-term goal of 'ensuring that all ASPA and ASMA management plans contain adequate content, and are clear, consistent, and likely to be effective' and, accordingly, expanded the SGMP's Terms of Reference to add a function of developing and suggesting procedures that would assist in achieving this long-term goal (Appendix 1).**
- (173) **The Committee endorsed the SGMP's proposed work plan (Appendix 2), which includes work over the next two years to revise the *Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas*, to plan further for a possible ASMA workshop, and to seek information from Members with a view to identifying options for achieving the long-term goal.**
-

- (174) The United States introduced WP 10 *Guidelines for the Application of Management Zones within Antarctic Specially Managed Areas and Antarctic Specially Protected Areas* which identified the wide range of zones used in existing ASMAs and ASPAs. It proposed a core set zones, and accompanying guidelines, which would help promote consistency between areas. This would assist not only those drafting management plans, but also people visiting

ASMAs and ASPAs. The United States proposed that the draft guidelines could be referred to the SGMP for consideration as part of its work to review the *Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas* (the Guide).

- (175) In response to a question from the Netherlands, the United States clarified that Visitor Zones would only apply to ASMAs, not to ASPAs.
- (176) The United Kingdom noted its agreement with the suggestion in the paper that the development of a core set of zones should not preclude the development of new zone categories as necessary.
- (177) ASOC agreed that zoning can be a very useful management tool, and noted that zones need to be strategically chosen, taking into account impacts of human activities and the values to be protected. In its view, zoning should not be used as a tool to simply reinforce continuing existing uses.
- (178) The Committee thanked the United States for the extremely useful framework, and agreed that WP 10 should be forwarded to the SGMP for consideration in its work to revise the Guide.
- (179) Argentina introduced WP 50 *Use of the Guidelines for the designation of Protected Areas* proposing that a number of additional elements be included in Resolution 1 (2008) “Guide to the Presentation of Working Papers Containing Proposals for ASPAs, ASMAs or HSMs”, to allow for confirmation that Resolution 1 (2000) *Guidelines for Implementation of the Framework for Protected Areas* (the Guidelines) were being implemented effectively.
- (180) The Committee welcomed Argentina’s objective of promoting the use of the Guidelines appended to Resolution 1 (2000). However some Members expressed the view that requiring proponents to present supporting information, as proposed, would create an additional administrative burden, and that management plans themselves should contain sufficient information about the reasons for designation.
- (181) While recognising concerns regarding the potential burden of this proposed additional paperwork, Argentina reiterated the crucial need to reinforce the use of the Guidelines in designating protected areas.
- (182) Norway supported the intention of Argentina’s proposal, and highlighted the value of Members providing early information to the Committee when considering the designation of a new area, such as in IP 33 *Blood Falls, Taylor Valley, Victoria Land: an initiative towards proposal of a new Antarctic Specially Protected Area* (United States).
- (183) Australia noted that the Guidelines appended to Resolution 1 (2000) had been adopted after the Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas, and that in the SGMP’s work to review the Guide it could be useful to include cross references to the Guidelines, as one means of further promoting their use.
- (184) The Committee agreed in principle on the benefit of following a process when developing protected area proposals and pursuing a systematic approach to the protected areas system. The Chair noted that the Committee might wish to keep under consideration other options for promoting the use of the guidelines, and the possible need to review and update them as necessary.
- (185) The United States briefly introduced IP 33 *Blood Falls, Taylor Valley, Victoria Land: an initiative towards proposal of a new Antarctic Specially Protected Area*, encouraging interested Members to participate in an ongoing discussion on whether and how to afford protection to this area.
- (186) The following papers were also submitted under this agenda item:
- IP 16 *Deception Island Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) Management Group report* (Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, US & UK)

- IP 18 *Bird populations on Deception Island* (Spain)
- IP 19 *Volcanic risk on Deception Island* (Spain)
- IP 31 *Revision of Maps for Antarctic Specially Managed Area No. 2 McMurdo Dry Valleys, Victoria Land* (United States)
- IP 40 *Report of the Larsemann Hills Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) Management Group* (Australia, China, India, Romania and Russia)
- IP 92 *Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station, South Pole Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA No. 5) 2010 Management Report* (United States)
- IP 95 *Management Report of Narębski Point, ASPA No. 171 (2009-2010)* (Korea)
- IP 115 *Revisión del ASMA N° 4. Isla Decepción. Bibliografía científica española* (Spain)
- SP 10 *Register of the status of Antarctic Specially Protected Area and Antarctic Specially Managed Area Management Plans* (Secretariat)

7b) Historic Sites and Monuments

- (187) The United States introduced WP 5 *Proposed addition of the Plaque Commemorating the PM-3A Nuclear Power Plant at McMurdo Station to the List of Historic Sites and Monument* proposing the plaque commemorating the PM-3A nuclear power plant at McMurdo station for addition to the List of Historic Sites and Monuments. The US noted that the plaque commemorates the significant technical achievement of safely installing, operating, and removing the first, and only, nuclear power plant in Antarctica.
- (188) The Russian Federation supported the proposal, noting that the plaque commemorates a memorable achievement, and represents a tribute to those involved.
- (189) The Committee endorsed the proposal and agreed to recommend to the ATCM the inclusion of the plaque on the list of Historic Sites and Monuments.
- (190) The United Kingdom and France presented WP 25 *Report of an incident at Wordie House (HSM No. 62)* (United Kingdom, France and Ukraine), for the information of the Committee, and in accordance with Article 13 of the Protocol. The United Kingdom briefly described an incident which resulted in some damage to Wordie House (HSM 62), believed to be caused by individuals from two yachts understood to originate from France. While there had been damage to the hut, and a risk to the safety of the individuals concerned, there were fortunately no injuries and the damage was subsequently repaired by a team from the United Kingdom Antarctic Heritage Trust which was working on the site.
- (191) The United Kingdom noted that this incident raised concern about the behaviour of a small minority of visitors, and also about the effectiveness of authorisation processes, and suggested there is a need to raise the awareness of the requirements of the Antarctic Treaty and the Protocol.
- (192) France thanked the United Kingdom and Ukraine for their assistance in launching an investigation into this event. France noted two potential breaches in this incident: entering Antarctica without authorisation; and forced entry into the historic site. France noted that investigations are ongoing, and made reference to a range of legal issues that may arise in relation to any legal proceedings.
- (193) The United Kingdom and France outlined their approaches to disseminating information on visit requirements to the yachting community, including through websites, yacht clubs and publications, and recommended that the Committee discuss strategies to communicate and enforce the provisions of the Protocol.
- (194) Ukraine echoed the concerns expressed by the United Kingdom and France, noting that the incident occurred in a regularly visited area, close to Vernadsky Station. Ukraine stated the

- individuals involved were not Ukrainian, and encouraged the Parties to expand their efforts to ensure that potential visitors were made aware of the requirements of the Protocol.
- (195) IAATO thanked the United Kingdom, France and Ukraine for raising awareness of these issues, and drew the attention of the Committee to its outreach efforts, designed to inform non-IAATO yacht and small boat operators of the requirements for visiting Antarctica.
- (196) The Russian Federation expressed its profound concern with this incident, and reminded the Committee of previous incidents involving its facilities, where it experienced similar difficulties in taking legal proceedings. The Russian Federation also noted that it is taking action to endow its station managers with law enforcement powers to facilitate the function of primary investigation.
- (197) Argentina echoed the concerns expressed, and noted it had experienced some similar incidents involving its own facilities. Argentina suggested that the advertising of adventure activities may encourage similar poor behaviour.
- (198) The United Kingdom welcomed the cooperation between Parties in responding to and investigating the incident but also highlighted that the vast majority of visitors to the Antarctic behaved responsibly.
- (199) The Committee expressed its concern at the incident, in particular the damage to a listed historic site, and noted that the proposals in WP 25 will be considered by the ATCM.
- (200) Argentina introduced WP 47 *Proposal for the discussion of aspects related to the management of Historic Sites and Monuments*. Argentina considered that further work is needed to develop practical, specific tools to ensure the protection of Historic Sites and Monuments. Argentina also referred to IP 22, *Additional information for the discussion of issues associated with the management and operation of Historic Sites and Monuments* which forms an appendix for WP 47 and contains a summary of current HSM management tools, as well as a brief analysis of the entries on the List of Historic Sites and Monuments.
- (201) Argentina suggested discussion of a change in the strategy for dealing with historic sites and monuments, both to evaluate the concept of what is considered to be “historic”, and to include the more holistic concept of ‘enhancement’, which encompasses protection, conservation and dissemination. Argentina proposed that the Committee establish an ICG for further discussion of these issues.
- (202) Chile welcomed Argentina’s work, noting that in its view ‘enhancement’ was an important concept that should underlay the approach to HSM’s.
- (203) Noting the large intersessional workload for Members, the Committee welcomed Argentina’s offer to lead informal discussions in the intersessional period, supported by the CEP web-based forum, with a view to reporting to CEP XIV.
- (204) Chile introduced WP 67 *Proposed Modification to Historic Site N° 37*, which outlines a proposal for protection for additional elements associated with the historic site and the former General Bernardo O’Higgins Base.
- (205) Noting that additional time would be required by some Parties to consult appropriate experts, the meeting welcomed Chile’s offer to work with Parties on the proposal during the intersessional period, with an opportunity for more detailed consideration at CEP XIV and any improvement which may be required for approval of this document.
- (206) Uruguay introduced IP 67 *Actualización del estudio de los restos históricos del naufragio de Punta Suffield*, an update on the status of the investigations of a shipwreck near Artigas station. Uruguay anticipated bringing forward a proposal for the inclusion of the shipwreck on the list of Historic Sites and Monuments in the future.

Advice to the ATCM

- (207) **The Committee recommends that the ATCM approves the addition of the following new site to the list of Historic Sites and Monuments held under Measures 3 (2003):**
- **Plaque Commemorating the PM-3A Nuclear Power Plant at McMurdo Station.**

7c) Site Guidelines

- (208) Proposals for five new Visitor Site Guidelines were presented to the Committee.
- (209) The United States introduced WP 17 *Antarctic Treaty Visitor Site Guide for Torgersen Island, Arthur Harbor, Southwest Anvers Island* noting that the area had long been of considerable interest for tourist visits because of its high biological diversity, its accessibility and its proximity to Palmer Station, which allows visitors to observe both Antarctic wildlife and scientific research operations. The United States noted that although activities at Torgersen Island are covered by the Management Plan for ASMA 7, it was important to present information in a format that was easily accessible to tour operators, guides and visitors.
- (210) The United Kingdom introduced WP 39 *Site Guidelines for Danco Island, Errera Channel, Antarctic Peninsula* (United Kingdom, United States and IAATO). The United Kingdom informed the Committee that the island was the site of the former British Base "O". It also has a colony of gentoo penguins and is frequently visited by tour operators, private yachts, and occasionally national Antarctic programmes.
- (211) Recalling its revision of the management plan for ASPA 106 Cape Hallett (WP 58), the United States presented WP 42 *Antarctic Treaty Visitor Site Guidelines for Seabee Hook, Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea*. The United States noted that controlled tourist visitation to the Adélie penguin colony on Seabee Hook, which had previously been allowed in accordance with the provisions for a Management Zone contained within ASPA 106, was more appropriately addressed through the framework of a Visitor Site Guideline. Following recent surveys, analyses and consultations, the Management Plan for ASPA 106 had been substantially revised and, as part of that process, two separate areas on Seabee Hook were assessed as suitable for continued tourist access, such that the values for which ASPA 106 was designated would not be compromised.
- (212) The United Kingdom presented WP 56 *Site Guidelines for Damoy Point, Wiencke Island, Antarctic Peninsula* (United Kingdom and Argentina). The area contains the Damoy Hut, a British air transit facility established in 1975 and designated as HSM 84 in 2009, and the Argentine Bahía Dorian Hut, established in 1953. The United Kingdom advised that Damoy Point is visited frequently by tour operators, private yachts and by national Antarctic programmes. It noted that the adoption of Visitor Site Guidelines for Danco Island and Damoy Point would mean that Site Guidelines and/or national operator procedures would be in place for the twenty most frequently visited tourist landing sites in Antarctica and that this was a significant achievement for the Committee.
- (213) France questioned whether the asbestos warning in the proposed Visitor Site Guidelines for Damoy Point was relevant given the short period of potential exposure during brief tourist visits.
- (214) The United Kingdom noted that other Visitor Site Guidelines include information about hazards and that any asbestos in the Damoy Hut was being managed.
- (215) Chile introduced WP 64 *Site Guidelines for the Northeast beach of Ardley Peninsula (Ardley Island), King George Island (25 de Mayo Island), South Shetland Islands* (Argentina and Chile). The paper contained a revised version of the draft Visitor Site Guidelines presented to CEP XII, modified to incorporate comments received during the intersessional period. Chile and Argentina highlighted the importance of Visitor Site Guidelines due to the close proximity of the site to ASPA 150 Ardley Island and the diverse biological values contained therein.
- (216) After making minor changes to the Site Guidelines for Danco Island and Damoy Point related to wildlife distances, the Committee approved these guidelines.

- (217) A number of Parties raised queries regarding provisions in the proposed Visitor Site Guidelines for Ardley Peninsula, including in relation to the provisions limiting access to only 40 visitors per day, and allowing visits by station personnel only on weekends.
- (218) Following further discussions during the meeting, it was not possible to reach agreement on the Site Guidelines as presented. The proponents agreed to consult with interested Parties during the intersessional period, with a view to submitting a final revised version for approval at CEP XIV. Chile and Argentina look forward to the adoption of these guidelines to afford protection to ASPA 150 next year.
- (219) The Committee agreed to present the Site Guidelines for Torgersen Island, Danco Island, Seabee Hook and Damoy Point to the ATCM for adoption.

Advice to the ATCM

(220) The Committee approved the guidelines for Torgersen Island, Danco Island, Damoy Point, and Seabee Hook, and agreed to forward them to the ATCM for adoption by means of a Resolution.

- (221) The United States briefly introduced IP 26 *Antarctic Site Inventory: 1994-2010* (United States), noting that the Antarctic Site Inventory continued to collect biological data and site-descriptive information in the Antarctic Peninsula, a project that had been underway since 1994. The Chair noted the utility of the data from the Antarctic Site Inventory and thanked Oceanites for its valuable contribution to the CEP's ongoing study into the environmental aspects and impacts of Antarctic tourism.
- (222) The Netherlands expressed its view that tourism should have no more than a minor or transitory impact, and that Site Guidelines should be enforced in a strict manner and might be linked to national processes of licenses and environmental impact assessments. It felt that, while Site Guidelines are a useful tool, additional measures are needed to control the impacts of tourism. ASOC expressed its support for these views.
- (223) IAATO presented IP 62 *Report on IAATO Member use of Antarctic Peninsula Landing Site and ATCM Visitor Site Guidelines*.
- (224) Several Parties noted the importance of having up-to-date information on tourism and thanked IAATO for its work to provide regular reports to the Committee.
- (225) The Chair recalled that CEP XII had established an ICG to discuss 1) the development of generic guidelines to go alongside site specific guidelines and 2) the process for reviewing site guidelines.
- (226) Several Members thanked Chile for leading the ICG, which had made useful progress during the intersessional period but had not completed its work. The Committee welcomed the offer by Australia (Dr Phillip Tracey) to leading the continuing work of the ICG during the coming intersessional period.
- (227) The Committee agreed the following Terms of Reference for the ICG:
- i. Review the environmental elements of Recommendation XVIII-1 (1994) Guidance for Visitors to the Antarctic, and Guidance for Those Organising and Conducting Tourism and Non-governmental Activities in the Antarctic and other advice to visitors including in Site Guidelines, Recommendations and Resolutions;
 - ii. Develop revised and updated guidance for visitors based on Recommendation XVIII-1 in a format that can also be used as a generic cover to accompany site specific guidelines;
 - iii. Consider options for how the CEP might most effectively assess new site guidelines and periodically review existing guidelines; and
 - iv. Report to CEP XIV on the outcomes of this work.

7d) Human footprint and wilderness values

- (228) Australia presented IP 48 *Topic Summary: Footprint* informing the Committee that, in order to facilitate the CEP's work to develop an agreed understanding of the term 'footprint', it had reviewed CEP meeting reports and meeting papers since 1998 referring to that concept. Australia also recalled that the topic had received more detailed consideration as part of the Committee's recent strategic planning discussions. From its review, Australia observed that several categories of 'footprint' have been identified over time, most of them considering footprint as a measure of the spatial extent of physical disturbance related to national programmes activities, although tourism is mentioned in some papers. The concept is also referred to in several CEEs. Other papers considered by the CEP in the past had discussed ways to measure, monitoring and reduce the footprint of various activities.
- (229) The Committee thanked Australia for preparing this topic summary which helpfully synthesised the CEP's past consideration of this issue.
- (230) The United Kingdom introduced WP 23 *Assessing cumulative environmental impacts: identifying the distribution and concentration of national operator activities in Antarctica* describing a method to estimate the spatial extent and chronology of human activities in Antarctica using information derived from a number of science and mapping databases. The activities of the United Kingdom within the Antarctic Peninsula region were shown as an example. The UK noted that science and survey work had been performed by Treaty Parties at sites dispersed throughout Antarctica for at least the last 65 years, and though reliable data on precise location of past activities is not always readily available, the spatial extent and chronology of national operator activities in Antarctica can be generated using location data held in existing science and mapping databases.
- (231) The UK suggested that the CEP endorses the use of existing systems in the collation of information relating to the location of past science, survey and logistic activities, in order to provide an holistic perspective of human impact across Antarctica, which could be used to inform future environmental policy and management. The UK further suggested that the CEP considers other methods to determine human activity at a regional and continent-wide scale.
- (232) The Committee thanked the UK for their paper and several Members noted the importance of this kind of work to integrate different sources of data to help in characterising human footprint in Antarctica.
- (233) Russia welcomed such a constructive approach to understanding human impact in Antarctica noting that human beings are now part of the Antarctic environment.
- (234) Argentina cautioned that Parties interested in undertaking such work explore this, as well as other likely approaches that may also be applicable.
- (235) The UK agreed and explained this was the approach recommended in the paper.
- (236) The United States suggested that Parties share ideas on how cumulative impacts may be assessed through a range of approaches. The US drew attention to its McMurdo Station monitoring programme which it would report on at CEP XIV, as well as a GIS it had developed to help manage activities in the McMurdo Dry Valleys.
- (237) COMNAP offered assistance through its data management expert group to examine other methods to determine human activity at a regional/continent-wide scale. Several Parties thanked COMNAP for their offer of assistance.
- (238) Australia recalled the CEP's obligations with regard to advising the ATCM on the state of the Antarctic environment and noted that approaches such as the one demonstrated by the UK would greatly assist in characterising human pressure on the Antarctic environment.
- (239) ASOC recalled the obligations under Article 8(3) of Annex III to the Protocol requiring Parties to prepare an inventory of sites of past activity. ASOC suggested that Members submit examples of such inventories to the Committee as a further means of assessing human footprint.

- (240) Germany supported ASOC's suggestion and noted that a centralised means of holding information of all sites of past activity in Antarctica would be extremely useful.
- (241) New Zealand welcomed the UK initiative noting that it was undertaking a similar exercise for its own national programme activities in the Ross Sea region. New Zealand also drew attention to its WP 29 *The concept of Human Footprint in the Antarctic* and supporting IP 49, with the same name. New Zealand noted that there was considerable overlap of issues including the concepts of wilderness, footprint, and human impacts and suggested that the Committee may need to develop an agreed understanding of such terms. New Zealand suggested that the study of human impacts in Antarctica be retained on the CEP's agenda and on its five-year work plan and looked forward to working with the UK and others in developing such initiatives in the intersessional period.
- (242) Argentina agreed that the CEP may need to define the term "footprint" and recalled that the CEP's EIA Guidelines include the term "output" which may be associated with the concept of footprint. Argentina also suggested that "Human Footprint" be moved on the CEP's agenda to item 6 on EIA matters due to the fact that its scope under Area Protection may be limited.
- (243) ASOC drew attention to its poster in the coffee area that explores the concept of footprint and welcomed comments and further collaboration on the subject.
- (244) The Committee agreed that this was an important issue and encouraged Members to work together during the intersessional period and to bring further papers to CEP XIV that might assist in developing a better understanding of the term "human footprint", as well as on data and information sources on human activities in Antarctica, including examples of inventories of sites of past activity, and examples of analytical methods that might be used to characterise human impacts in Antarctica.
- (245) The Committee agreed that it would consider where the issue of human footprint should sit on its agenda at its next meeting.
- (246) ASOC presented IP 81 *Coastal Hydrocarbon Pollution: A Case Study from Deception Island, Antarctica* on monitoring activities conducted in 2001/02 which identified detectable hydrocarbon concentrations at a number of Deception Island coastal sites. ASOC said that the results suggested that regular and effective monitoring should take place to allow assessment of the impacts of ongoing activities at Deception Island as well as at other Antarctic sites where high levels of shipping occur.
- (247) Spain's IP 20 *Possible human impact on Deception Island* describing tourist activities in Deception Island and detected impacts on the local environment was noted by the Committee.

7e) Marine Spatial Protection and Management

- (248) New Zealand introduced IP 107 *Bioregionalisation and Spatial Ecosystem Processes in the Ross Sea Region* informing the Committee of the outcomes to a Workshop on Bioregionalisation and Spatial Ecosystem Processes in the Ross Sea Region, held in Wellington, New Zealand in June 2009. The aim of the workshop was to contribute to the identification and potential designation of marine protected areas. The workshop was well attended by international experts. New Zealand noted that the outputs from the workshop included a fine-scale benthic/demersal bioregionalisation of the Ross Sea region, a fine-scale pelagic bioregionalisation of the Ross Sea region, as well as an agreed list of spatially bounded ecosystem processes of particular importance in the regional ecosystem, and which may be amenable to protection using spatial management tools.
- (249) New Zealand noted that it intended to submit the workshop report to the next meeting of SC-CAMLR's Working Group on Ecosystem Monitoring and Management (WG-EMM).
- (250) The SC-CAMLR Observer thanked New Zealand for introducing the report and reminded the Committee that CCAMLR had in place a well developed programme for working towards a network of marine protected areas by the 2012 deadline. Through its own Southern Ocean bioregionalisation exercise CCAMLR had identified 11 priority areas for action, which had also

been endorsed by the CEP (Appendix 4 of the report of CEP XII refers). In 2009 SC-CAMLR had also agreed a timetable of action to work towards the 2012 deadline. This timetable is referred to in WP 7 and IP 12.

- (251) The SC-CAMLR Observer noted that in taking this forward CCAMLR would be looking to draw on expertise elsewhere, in particular within SCAR and CEP. In that regard the SC-CAMLR Observer invited a CEP Observer to attend WG-EMM in July 2010, as well as the planned CCAMLR workshop in 2011. During both of these meetings, work will be undertaken to synthesize relevant data from multiple sources. Thus, the Committee was invited to facilitate submission of such information to WG-EMM.
- (252) The US noted CCAMLR's timetable for action on marine spatial protection and suggested that this might be reflected in the CEP's five year work plan, noting the invitation for a CEP Observer to attend WG-EMM and the 2011 workshop.
- (253) Italy introduced IP 45 *Terra Nova Bay – Wood Bay Marine Protected Area inside a wider proposal for a Ross Sea MPA* recalling that the establishment of spatial protection for marine biodiversity had been identified as a priority issue by both the CEP and SC-CAMLR. Italy informed the Committee that the aim of the proposed MPA was to conserve and protect the unique and outstanding environment of the Terra Nova Bay region by regulating the activities within the area. The area would require special management to ensure that the important values are protected and sustained in the long-term, especially the extensive scientific data sets collected over the last 25 years. The Committee also noted that the Republic of Korea and Italy will be holding a workshop on Terra Nova Bay Marine Protected Area at the end of May in Rome.
- (254) Italy noted that it would also send the paper and possibly a report from the joint Italy - Republic of Korea workshop to SC-CAMLR's WG-EMM in July 2010 for further consideration alongside other spatial marine management papers, including the outcomes to New Zealand's Ross Sea bioregionalisation workshop.
- (255) Australia, supported by the United Kingdom, suggested that the CEP should welcome and support the action taken by CCAMLR, including to afford protection to the South Orkneys Islands marine area and to establish a timetable for actions to develop a marine protected areas system. Australia recalled that the joint CEP/SC-CAMLR workshop had recognised that the issue of marine spatial protection and management is best led by SC-CAMLR, and that the CEP had previously stressed the need to constructively engage in and support SC-CAMLR's work in this area. Australia noted that it would be useful to establish a suitable mechanism to ensure such engagement takes place.
- (256) Argentina noted its support for any measures to improve marine conservation in the Southern Ocean, but noted that the CEP and ATCM needed to give attention as to how they might also take action to achieve this.
- (257) Belgium recorded its support for the priority attention being paid to marine protection mechanisms in the Ross Sea region so as to make good progress by the 2012 deadline.
- (258) The Netherlands strongly supported the priority being given to a marine protected area network, noting that a lot needs to be done before the 2012 deadline. It further noted that establishing such a network becomes all the more important because of climate change.
- (259) The Committee welcomed CCAMLR's efforts to afford protection to this marine area in the South Orkney Islands.
- (260) ASOC introduced IP 77 *The Case for Inclusion of the Ross Sea Continental Shelf and Slope in a Southern Ocean Network of Marine Reserves*. ASOC noted the significant biological diversity of the Ross Sea and the extent of baseline ecological data and urged that comprehensive protection be afforded to the Ross Sea.
- (261) France, New Zealand and the US thanked ASOC for their valuable contribution to the discussion on Marine Protected Areas.

- (262) ASOC also presented IP 83 *Rising to the Challenge: Key steps to deliver a Comprehensive and Representative Marine Protected Areas Network in the Southern Ocean by 2012* on the important milestones for the next several years necessary to achieve a comprehensive and representative network of marine protected areas and marine reserves across the Southern Ocean by 2012.
- (263) The Committee thanked ASOC for this paper.
- (264) The Committee welcomed SC-CAMLR's work on marine protected areas and expressed its desire to remain closely involved in SC-CAMLR's work and remain abreast of developments in this area of mutual interest. The Chair noted that the ASMA workshop proposed by the SGMP intends to address the issue of how the ASMA mechanism might usefully be applied to the concept of marine protected areas, and that this might also assist SC-CAMLR's further deliberation on this issue.
- (265) In response to a suggestion by the United Kingdom, the Secretariat agreed to consider preparing a summary of the work that the CEP has done on marine protected areas as a contribution to SC-CAMLR's efforts.

Advice to the ATCM

- (266) **The Committee welcomed the evolving cooperation with SC-CAMLR and, noting that the issue of spatial marine management will be discussed in detail, accepted SC-CAMLR's invitation to send an observer to SC-CAMLR's WG-EMM meeting in July 2010. The Committee nominated Dr George Watters (US) as its observer to WG-EMM.**
- (267) **The Committee recognised SC-CAMLR's timetable for action towards developing a network of marine protected areas by the 2012 deadline, and mirrored the timetable in the CEP's five-year work programme, noting that it would nominate observers to CCAMLR meetings and workshops as appropriate.**
- (268) **The Committee further welcomed CCAMLR's progress in affording protection to a marine area in the South Orkney Islands and encouraged further areas to be identified in the 11 priority areas endorsed by both SC-CAMLR and CEP.**

-
- (269) Uruguay introduced IP 32 *Identificación y evaluación de la acción antrópica de grupos poblacionales de mamíferos marinos pinnípedos en áreas de la costa del Estrecho de Drake*, which referred to fishing activity debris and pinniped populations on such beaches.
- (270) An additional paper submitted under this Agenda item was:
IP 58 Designation of a new Marine Protected Area for the South Orkney Islands southern shelf (United Kingdom)

7f) Other Annex V Matters

- (271) SCAR introduced WP 3 *Biodiversity-based Evaluation of the Environmental Domains Analysis* recalling that, at ATCM XXX, it had agreed to undertake an assessment of the extent to which the outcome of the Environmental Domains Analysis (EDA) corresponds with patterns found in spatially explicit biodiversity data for the region compiled in the SCAR Biodiversity Database. SCAR noted that the use of abiotic environmental variables as surrogate measures of diversity is a well-established approach used for other continental regions. It informed the Committee that the EDA provided a useful and important measure of environmental variation across Antarctica that, in terms of the ice-free domains, can be considered essential as a first order assessment of likely systematic variation in biodiversity.
- (272) SCAR suggested that for meaningful analysis at the finer spatial scales typically used in protected area designation, the EDA must be supplemented with biodiversity data, which not only reflect current conditions but, importantly, historical processes that cannot in many instances be captured by modern environmental data.

- (273) The Committee welcomed this comprehensive and useful work by SCAR. Noting that more comprehensive terrestrial biodiversity information would increase the ability to undertake detailed and thorough analyses, the Committee agreed that Members should strongly encourage national scientific programmes to collect further biodiversity data and make such data available via the SCAR Biodiversity Database maintained by the Australian Antarctic Division. The Committee noted that such action was also encouraged by the ATME on Climate Change (Recommendation 20). The Committee also noted that the EDA was one tool to assist with further developing the protected areas system, but that it was important to draw effectively on all available tools.
- (274) Australia noted that SCAR's assessment might also usefully serve as the basis for an interim biodiversity assessment or baseline for state of the Antarctic environment reporting.
- (275) India informed the Committee that a monograph of lichens has already been published.
- (276) Australia introduced WP 54 *Enhancing the Antarctic Protected Areas Database to help assess and further develop the protected areas system*. It recalled that at CEP XII the Committee endorsed the SGMP's suggestions on: including additional information in the protected areas database; and promoting the use of global positioning systems (GPS) to accurately define protected area boundaries. Australia proposed that the Committee consider expanding the protected areas database to incorporate additional information, including the primary reason for designation, values being protected, an accurate indication of the size of the area and the environmental domain(s) represented. It also proposed that the Committee consider encouraging proponents of ASPAs and ASMAs to submit area boundaries in a suitable digital format. Collectively, these actions would assist the CEP to assess how existing or proposed protected areas represent the environmental domains and the suite of values identified by Annex V for protection in ASPAs.
- (277) Many Members and ASOC supported the proposals, noting the benefits of making such data and information centrally available through the Secretariat website. Other Members supported the proposals in principle but noted a need to further consider the detail of some elements, including regarding a consistent approach to describing geospatial data.
- (278) Australia thanked the Committee for these remarks and invited comments from interested parties during the intersessional period, with a view to possibly bringing an updated proposal to the next meeting. Australia also indicated that it would discuss these ideas further with the Secretariat.
- (279) The United Kingdom introduced WP 16 *The Implications of Climate Change for the Antarctic Protected Areas System*. It noted that climate change is likely to have significant implications for terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecosystems, and for ASPAs protecting these environments, in particular in areas where regional climate warming is established (for example, the Antarctic Peninsula). The United Kingdom also noted that ASPAs should become an increasingly important tool in mitigating the impacts of climate change, by ensuring that other pressures are minimised.
- (280) The United Kingdom proposed that the CEP consider:
- How to ensure a more strategic approach to ASPA selection and designation. Such an approach should consider the implications of climate change, particularly in regions of rapid change (eg, Antarctic Peninsula). It should be evidence-based, dynamic and flexible enough to fast-track the protection of important new sites and facilitate the de-listing of sites for which the principal values no longer exist;
 - Developing a methodology for classifying existing ASPAs continent-wide according to their potential vulnerability to regional climate change;
 - Whether particular attention should be given to ASPAs which contain, or whose boundaries comprise, ice-fronts. In some cases, automatic temporary protection might be afforded to newly-exposed ground following ice retreat;
 - Giving newly-exposed marine habitats protection following the collapse of ice-shelves to allow scientific research to establish baseline information and monitor further change;

- Whether further spatial protection for species that are particularly vulnerable to climate change (eg, Adélie and emperor penguins) is appropriate to minimise other impacts that might limit their survival in marginal locations;
 - Reviewing the need for further or continued site-protection of species whose abundance or range has increased substantially under climate warming;
 - Whether it would be appropriate to use the ASPA system to protect natural colonisation and establishment events on the basis of their importance to science, and their uniqueness or rarity.
- (281) The Committee noted that this paper had also been submitted to the ATME on Climate Change, and that some of these proposals were reflected in the recommendations outlined in the ATME report (WP 63), particularly including:
- Recommendation 24: The ATME recommends that CEP review the means of applying protected and managed area management tools to ensure sufficient flexibility to account for climate change effects. Such a review should consider:
 - the need to ensure that climate change effects are assessed during each five-yearly review of management plans, including for example, the need to establish protected and managed area boundaries that are climate change resilient; and
 - the potential to delist sites at which the original values to be protected have been lost or degraded.
 - Recommendation 25: The ATME recommends that the CEP consider a systematic approach to protected or managed areas to:
 - protect species, or habitats identified to be of particular risk to climate change consequences (cf. Recommendation 18);
 - accommodate areas that have potential to be environmental or climate refuges;
 - set aside areas for future climate change related research, including reference areas.
 - Recommendation 26: The ATME recommends, recognising the responsibilities of and need to coordinate with CCAMLR, that the CEP consider, and advise the ATCM accordingly, as to means by which automatic interim protection might be afforded to newly exposed areas, such as marine areas exposed through ice-shelf collapse.
- (282) The United Kingdom indicated its intention to undertake work to classify protected areas according to their vulnerability to climate change, and to report back to CEP XIV.
- (283) Argentina and France agreed that climate change needs to be considered in the management of Antarctica and the designation of ASPAs and ASMAs, but noted that it was important to consider candidate areas on a case-by-case basis rather than designate areas automatically. Argentina also emphasised the importance of using existing tools for selecting protected areas (eg, Resolution 1 (2000)) and drawing on other available management tools as appropriate (eg, specially protected species designation).
- (284) ASOC noted that the concept of interim protection was not new and cited the example of new islands' protection under Recommendation VI-11.
- (285) The United States emphasised the importance of including climate change in future planning as opposed to responding to changes as they happen. It suggested that the forward-looking paper (WP 16) be submitted to CCAMLR and WG-EMM for their consideration.
- (286) Australia noted that the protected areas system is a fundamental environmental management tool, including for maximising the resilience of the Antarctic environment and ecosystems to climate change. It also noted that climate change may have implications for the continuing protection of values within existing protected areas. These are each important issues for the CEP's attention

- when developing advice to the ATCM on protection of the Antarctic environment and on managing the protected areas system. Australia noted that it would be important to revisit the paper's recommendations in conjunction with the climate change recommendations.
- (287) The Netherlands noted its support for the United Kingdom's proposals and in particular, the fifth recommendation on affording protection to key vulnerable species.
- (288) Norway emphasised that discussion of these recommendations should be added to the Committee's five-year work plan, and underscored its interest in continuing discussion of these issues informally during the intersessional period.
- (289) The Committee welcomed the United Kingdom's initiative, and noted that the protected areas system was an important tool to management the implications of climate change. The Committee also welcomed the United Kingdom's offer to take forward work on classifying existing protected areas according to their vulnerability to climate change. It agreed to consider the issues raised in WP 16 in its forward planning through the five-year work plan, and to make the paper available to the SGMP and to WG-EMM for consideration.
- (290) Germany introduced WP 40 *Third Progress Report on the Discussion of the International Working Group about Possibilities for Environmental Management of Fildes Peninsula and Ardley Island* (Chile and Germany) summarising the actions of the International Working Group (IWG) established to consider a management scheme for the Fildes Peninsula region. It noted that an IWG meeting held in July 2009 in Punta Arenas had discussed the need to establish and to further define a Facilities Zone in the area. Germany also advised that a revised draft management plan for Fildes Peninsula had been produced during the intersessional period.
- (291) Germany noted that while some progress had been made on developing a management framework for the Fildes Peninsula region, the following aspects should be taken into consideration in future discussions:
- the spatial synthesis of the different requirements concerning a possible Facilities Zone, on the basis of the maps submitted by the countries with stations in the area;
 - the proposed revised management plan and its relationship with the existing and any proposed ASPA in the region;
 - any missing requirements, either in the information already provided by stations, or in other matters requiring coordination and enhancing or contributing to the justification for a Fildes Peninsula ASMA.
- (292) Other participants in the IWG thanked Chile and Germany for their leadership of the group.
- (293) Uruguay noted that the IWG would continue intersessional work on developing a system of Codes of Conduct for the environmental protection of the region. It cited the discussion of Ardley Island as an example of the development of this system.
- (294) Argentina emphasised the importance of collaboratively managing this sensitive area, and expressed its hope for an expedient process in developing guidelines.
- (295) The Russian Federation highlighted the difficulty of developing a management plan for the region, given the geographic extent, the number of stations, and the multi-national nature of the human presence in this area. It noted that the Working Group was moving in the right direction to address these challenges.
- (296) Chile and Germany expressed their gratitude to all members of the Working Group and welcomed additional participants and feedback. They also informed the meeting that the international working group will continue its work intersessionally at the web-based discussion forum as discussed at the informal meeting of the IWG held on 5 May in Punta del Este.
- (297) The Committee commended the IWG for its progress to develop a cooperative international management framework for the Fildes Peninsula region.

- (298) The United States presented IP 2 *Spatial Patterns of Tour Ship Traffic in the Antarctic Peninsula Region*, which introduced a joint paper by *Oceanites Inc.*, the US and IAATO that reviewed the pattern of tour ship traffic along the Antarctic Peninsula. The paper discussed human impacts in the Peninsula region, established a prioritisation of sites for monitoring programmes, analysed strategic approaches to the development of future management tools and reviewed current management tools. The paper had been submitted to the ATME on ship-borne tourism and was also submitted for discussion under ATCM Agenda Item 11.
- (299) The United States expressed its interest in collection of all relevant data and in collaboration with any interested parties. Ukraine and IAATO noted the value of such collaborative efforts.
- (300) The Committee commended the authors of the paper, which would be a useful reference for the ongoing CEP tourism study.
- (301) Ukraine introduced IP 71 *Progress on Designation of Broad-scale Management System in the Vernadsky Station Area* and emphasised its appreciation to Germany for its methodological support and full-scale consultation during the previous intersessional period. Ukraine indicated that it would welcome any comments on this paper during the coming intersessional period.

Item 8: Conservation of Antarctic Fauna and Flora

a) Quarantine and non-native species

- (302) The United Kingdom introduced IP 42 *Colonisation status of known non-native species in the Antarctic terrestrial environment*, summarising information on non-native species that have been recorded in the Antarctic terrestrial environment, and providing details of their colonisation status. It reported that all of the recorded non-native species have been found close to research stations or field huts, that species from a range of biological groups are capable of colonising Antarctica, and that two non-native species in Antarctica were expanding their distribution. The United Kingdom noted that the issue of non-native species introductions has surpassed theoretical concerns, and is an issue already requiring management.
- (303) France introduced WP 9 *Open-ended Intersessional Contact Group on “Non-Native Species” (NNS) - 2009-2010 Report*, updating the Committee on the results of the first year of discussions by the ICG that was established at the CEP XII. France informed that thirteen Members, Observers and Experts had participated in the discussions based on the agreed terms of reference, and that those discussions produced the following outputs:
- An introductory text and a glossary of terms were drafted to support the Committee’s work on non-native species in the Antarctic context and to be appended to a future quarantine manual.
 - A draft text defining the overall objective and key guiding principles for Parties’ actions to address non-native species concerns. Twelve guiding principles were proposed and categorised according to the three major components of a non-native species management framework (prevention, monitoring and response).
 - A proposed set of measures to minimise the risk of introduction of non-native species, (where ‘introduction’ includes the transfer of species to Antarctica and between sites in Antarctica). These measures, collectively, would be used to form the basis of a future quarantine manual. The measures were ranked by the ICG according to the extent to which they were easily applicable and able to be generalised to all Parties. It was noted that the ranking was only used to assist the ICG process.
 - The ICG identified particular aspects of Antarctic operations for which further work might be required in order to develop specific guidance, as well as suggested priorities and potential stakeholders. The ICG noted that it would be important to regularly review priorities as work on this subject develops.

- (304) France, on behalf of the ICG participants, invited the Committee:
- to comment on the conclusions of the report;
 - to endorse the outputs from this period of intersessional work (introductory text, glossary, overall objective, key principles);
 - to consider incorporating actions required to provide specific guidance in the CEP five-year work plan;
 - to provide indications to the ICG for the continuation of the work, namely the development of specific aspects of a manual, in line with the most applicable measures identified by the ICG; and
 - to encourage all the Parties, Observers and Experts to participate in the next steps of the ICG, recognising that such a manual will be useful only if elaborated by the largest group of “users”.
- (305) The Committee, IAATO, COMNAP and SCAR noted their support for this urgent and high priority work and commended the ICG, France and Dr Yves Frenot as the ICG convener, for their work.
- (306) The United Kingdom reminded the Committee of existing guidelines applicable to the issue of non-native species that the ICG could draw on to include in a manual, for example, the Ballast Water Guidelines. The United Kingdom emphasised the importance of applying a precautionary approach to the issue of non-native species, particularly in the absence of baseline scientific data.
- (307) Several Members highlighted the word ‘prevention’ in the overall objective (as drafted in WP 9), noting that it was an absolute term, and that terms like ‘minimising’ or ‘reducing’ risks might be more appropriate. France noted that the ICG discussed this matter, and the majority of participants recognised that in practice the measures would minimise the risk of non-native species introduction but that the overall objective should be prevention, which is a higher standard, consistent with the principles of the Protocol.
- (308) Argentina also noted that the meaning of ‘species’ in this context might need further definition as, for example, application of this word to micro-organisms is limited. France agreed, noting that further work is needed to clarify the language.
- (309) The Committee agreed that the quarantine manual could be more appropriately named the ‘non-native species manual’ or something similar, as the word ‘quarantine’ did not resonate for all Members.
- (310) Argentina indicated some concern over development of requirements and operational procedures. Australia recalled that the purpose of the work on a manual was to assist Parties to meet the requirements of Annex II.
- (311) The United States noted the emphasis on terrestrial non-native species and suggested that the work might be expanded to include consideration of marine non-native species and non-human vectors.
- (312) The Committee offered overall support for the ICG’s work, and reiterated the importance of managing this issue, and the priority of this work in the five-year work plan.
- (313) The Committee accepted the offer by New Zealand (Jana Newman) to convene the Group, and agreed the following Terms of Reference:
- i. Continue the discussion on the overall objective and key guiding principles for Parties’ actions to address risks posed by non-native species.
 - ii. Continue the development of a suggested set of generally applicable measures (practical measures, tools or procedures), to prevent or minimise the risk of the introduction of non-native species, and to monitor and to respond to any introductions (including the transfer of species between sites in Antarctica). The ICG will consider the recent work presented by several

Parties at CEP XIII, the relevant recommendations from the ATME on the implications of climate change, and the existing guidelines endorsed by the ATCM or those used by other bodies (eg, COMNAP, SCAR, IAATO, IMO) for inclusion in a manual.

- iii. Continue the identification of particular aspects of Antarctic operations for which further work might be required in order to develop specific guidance.
 - iv. Report to CEP XIV on progress with the above.
- (314) SCAR presented WP 4 *Preliminary Results from the International Polar Year Programme: Aliens in Antarctica* noting that the CEP had recognised non-native species as a major concern in Antarctica. SCAR reported that, as part of the International Polar Year, the Aliens in Antarctica project was an international effort to assess propagule pressure and pathways in an integrated way.
- (315) SCAR reported on the preliminary analyses of data on vascular plant seeds carried by visitors to the region. A total of 850 people travelling on 23 different ships and aircraft were sampled. These preliminary analyses suggested that the personnel posing the highest risks of non-native species propagule transfer (specifically plant seeds) are those from national Antarctic programmes, tourist support personnel, and tourists travelling with national Antarctic programmes or on small vessels. SCAR advised that final analyses will emerge over the next few years.
- (316) COMNAP noted there will be a COMNAP-SCAR workshop on non-native species in Buenos Aires in August 2010.
- (317) The United Kingdom welcomed WP 4 and noted that non-native species would be discussed during upcoming meetings of the IPY and COMNAP. The United Kingdom highlighted the relevance of these discussions to the CEP and suggested that results from each meeting be presented to CEP XIV.
- (318) Australia noted that the findings reported in WP 4 usefully identify the relative risks associated with types of visitor and types of equipment, and demonstrate the need to develop and implement practical preventive measures, consistent with Recommendation 23 from the ATME on Climate Change.
- (319) Dr Yves Frenot of France informed the Committee that he would be attending the IPY and COMNAP meetings and offered to report the meetings' conclusions to the next CEP. The Committee thanked Dr Frenot for his offer and looked forward to his reports.
- (320) Argentina noted that SCAR had invited the CEP to its upcoming meeting in Buenos Aires and highlighted the opportunity this presented to the CEP to circulate information on this issue.
- (321) The Committee thanked SCAR for the report, noted the relevance of climate change to the issue of non-native species, and looked forward to seeing the full results of the study when they become available.
- (322) SCAR presented WP 6 *Current knowledge for reducing risks posed by terrestrial non-native species: towards an evidence-based approach* (SCAR and Australia) noting that the primary objective of the document was to provide an overview of how further to consider the risks associated with non-native species, in keeping with global conservation best practice and the developing framework for such management in the region.
- (323) SCAR noted three major challenges: the introduction of non-native species not indigenous to the area south of 60°S (extraregional introduction); the movement and further establishment of indigenous species among different regions of Antarctica (extralimital introduction); and the introgression of populations, constituting the movement of individuals (by humans) among populations that are genetically distinct (genetic homogenization).
- (324) Several Members thanked SCAR and Australia for their work and noted similar work being conducted by their own national programmes. New Zealand informed the Committee that it was currently developing a risk-based approach to its work on reducing introduction of non-native species and looked forward to sharing its results with the CEP.

- (325) New Zealand noted the diversity of Working Papers on the subject of non-native species, highlighted the need for taking a strategic risk based approach and noted the importance of both understanding native systems, and implementing simple practical procedures.
- (326) ASOC thanked SCAR and Australia for WP 6 and encouraged Members to act on the key conclusions of the paper, particularly conducting baseline biodiversity surveys and developing survey protocols for detection and response in highly visited areas, especially those that are showing rapid change.
- (327) The UK informed the Committee that IP 44 outlined its framework for scientists attempting to determine the colonisation status of newly discovered terrestrial or freshwater species within the Antarctic Treaty area.
- (328) Russia informed the Committee that it had commenced its non-native species monitoring programme in 2004. Russia expressed its willingness to share data from this monitoring programme with interested Members.
- (329) The Chair suggested that the ICG on non-native species take into account the conclusions of this paper into their work.
- (330) The United Kingdom presented WP 14 *Intra-regional transfer of species in terrestrial Antarctica* noting that with ongoing human activities in Antarctica, human mediated intra-regional transfer of species will continue, with the result that over time Antarctica's unique biological assemblages and scientific research opportunities may be compromised. It also noted that Antarctic species indigenous to one region are likely to have pre-adaptation to cold environments found in the other areas of Antarctica, therefore increasing the likelihood of survival and establishment of intra-regionally transferred species. The United Kingdom also considered that, given the lack of information of baseline biodiversity in some areas, a precautionary approach might be appropriate until adequate biodiversity information is available.
- (331) The United Kingdom, therefore, recommended that the Committee:
- encourage the on-going synthesis of available knowledge on the biogeography, bioregionalisation and endemism within Antarctica by SCAR;
 - discuss the spatial scale at which biosecurity measures aimed at reducing the risk of intra-regional species transfer might be practicably applied; and
 - consider the precautionary approach of intra-regional transfer biosecurity measures between major biogeographical zones, where detailed biodiversity surveys are incomplete.
- (332) Many Members, SCAR and ASOC congratulated the United Kingdom on its paper, noting the importance of the work.
- (333) The Committee expressed general support for the sentiment of the paper and the recommendations, saw this as a thought provoking paper and noted more work on this issue would be useful.
- (334) The United Kingdom presented WP 8 *Draft procedures for vehicle cleaning to prevent transfer of non-native species into and around Antarctica* reminding the Meeting that a first proposal on these procedures had been presented at CEP XII. It noted that the proposed procedures had been created to reduce the risk of biological material being transported by vehicles into and around Antarctica.
- (335) Grateful for the excellent input during the intersessional period, the United Kingdom recommended the revised guidelines be endorsed by the Committee and inserted into the upcoming non-native species manual.
- (336) Many Members and IAATO thanked the United Kingdom for these guidelines, noting they represent an excellent example of measures to prevent non-native introduction.
- (337) IAATO noted it would adopt these guidelines until the more comprehensive manual from the work of the ICG is available.

- (338) The Committee welcomed the guidelines in WP 8 and agreed to send the recommendations on to the ICG on non-native species for further consideration of how best to incorporate these into the non-native species manual. In the meantime, Parties were invited to consider using these guidelines to help protect the environment from the impacts of non-native species introductions.
- (339) The United Kingdom presented WP 15 *Guidance for visitors and environmental managers following the discovery of a suspected non-native species in the terrestrial and freshwater Antarctic environment*, stressing that preventing the introduction of non-native species must continue to be the primary means of protection. The United Kingdom also noted that, as it is difficult to predict the level of invasiveness of a newly introduced non-native species, the 'precautionary principle' should be applied, and a confirmed introduced species should be assumed to be highly invasive and therefore if practicable, eradicated or contained as soon as possible.
- (340) The UK further identified IP 44 *Suggested framework and considerations for scientists attempting to determine the colonisation status of newly discovered terrestrial or freshwater species within the Antarctic Treaty Area* that accompanied WP 15.
- (341) The United Kingdom introduced IP 43 *Eradication of a vascular plant species recently introduced to Whalers Bay, Deception Island* (United Kingdom and Spain), stating it was this event that stimulated the production of the draft practical guidance within WP 15 and IP 44.
- (342) The United Kingdom recommended that the draft guidance proposed in WP 15 and IP 44 be considered by the CEP, and invited comment during the intersessional period. The Committee supported that approach, and supported the goal of inclusion, following appropriate revision and review, into the manual proposed by the ICG on non-native species.
- (343) The Committee and IAATO thanked the United Kingdom for the instructive information in WP 15 and noted their request that Parties use the procedures on a trial basis over the next year to guide intersessional comment.
- (344) The following paper was also submitted under this agenda item:
- IP 14 *The Role of Human Activities in the Introduction of Non-Native Species into Antarctica and in the Distribution of Organisms Within the Antarctic* (Germany)

b) Specially protected Species

- (345) No papers were submitted under this agenda item.

c) Other Annex II Matters

- (346) Australia presented IP 41 *Southern giant petrel monitoring in ASPA 167, Hawker Island, using automated cameras* noting that, consistent with Resolution 5 (2009) Protection of the Southern Giant Petrel, it is trialling the use of digital automated cameras to monitor the breeding colony of southern giant petrels in ASPA 167, Hawker Island. Australia invited interested Members to contact the project manager identified in the paper.
- (347) The Committee recalled that the following recommendations from the ATME on Climate Change (WP 63) were of relevance to this agenda item:
- Recommendation 17: The ATME recommends that the ATCM encourages SCAR to incorporate identification of key regions, habitats and species at greatest risk from climate change effects into its research programmes.
 - Recommendation 20: The ATME recommends that the ATCM and CEP encourage national Antarctic programmes to undertake marine and terrestrial biodiversity surveys and to submit, as a matter of urgency, all relevant biodiversity data to appropriate databases (eg, the Biodiversity Database). In conducting such surveys, priority attention should be paid to regions considered to

be at high risk of climate change impacts as well as to existing protected areas established to protect biological values.

- (348) SCAR noted that many existing research programmes address the issues raised in these recommendations, and that they will be encouraged to continue to the extent possible.
- (349) The Committee supported the ATME recommendations, welcomed the valuable contributions being made by SCAR, and encouraged the continuation of such work.
- (350) The following papers were also submitted under this agenda item:
- IP 47 *Census of Antarctic Marine Life (CAML)* (SCAR and Australia)
 - IP 117 *Biodiversidad Microbiológica y Aplicaciones Biotecnológicas* (Ecuador)
 - IP 118 *Aislamiento e Identificación de Bacterias Antárticas Capaces de Biodegradar Hidrocarburos* (Ecuador)

Item 9: Environmental Monitoring and Reporting

a) Climate Change

- (351) Norway introduced WP 63 *Report from Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts on Implications of Climate Change for Antarctic Management and Governance*. Norway noted that the ATME on Climate Change and Implications for Management and Governance of the Antarctic Region had been held in Svolvær, Norway in April 2010. Norway noted that it had been a very successful meeting attended by representatives of 15 Treaty Parties, as well as experts and invited organisations.
- (352) Norway recalled that the ATME had been established by the ATCM under Decision 1 (2009) which required the ATME to:
- examine key scientific aspects of climate change and consequences of such change to the Antarctic terrestrial and marine environment;
 - the implications of climate change to management of Antarctic activities;
 - the need for monitoring, scenario planning and risk assessments;
 - the outcomes of the Copenhagen negotiations relevant for the Antarctic, and
 - the need for further consideration of any of the above issues and manners in which this can be achieved.
- (353) Norway noted that the Meeting particularly emphasised the importance of the SCAR report on Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment (ACCE), as a fundamental source of scientific information and the importance that the findings and recommendations of the report will play in further consideration of climate change issues in the Antarctic.
- (354) Norway also noted that the Meeting agreed that Antarctic climate change and the implications for governance and management in Antarctica is both a relevant and important topic to discuss under the Antarctic Treaty system and emphasised the importance of continuing the discussions on climate change issues in Antarctica.
- (355) Norway informed the CEP that the ATME had agreed 30 recommendations (Appendix 3) covering a range of issues for consideration by the ATCM and CEP. Norway drew attention in particular to those recommendations that were of particular relevance to the work of the CEP, notably: ATME Recommendations 1, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30.
- (356) The Committee congratulated Norway and the UK for hosting the Meeting of Experts. The Committee noted that climate change was an important topic, that it spanned many CEP agenda items, and that it warranted on-going consideration by the CEP. It also acknowledged the

importance of SCAR's ACCE Report as a guide to discussion at the Meeting and as a valuable tool for further understanding the Antarctic environment.

- (357) New Zealand noted that it was critical for the CEP to take account of the drivers and effects of climate change in managing human activity in Antarctica. New Zealand noted the important role the CEP has to play in contributing to the pool of knowledge on climate change implications for Antarctica and to advising the ATCM on the state of the Antarctic environment under Article 12(1)(j) of the Environmental Protocol.
- (358) Germany endorsed the outcomes to the ATME, noting in particular the recommendation to place climate change as a separate item on the CEP's agenda (Recommendation 30) and for the CEP to develop a climate change work programme (Recommendation 19).
- (359) The UK noted the large number of recommendations from the ATME and suggested that these would need to be prioritised and handled in the short, medium and long-term. The UK also emphasised the need to take a comprehensive ecosystem approach to managing the implications of climate change, which would require cooperation with other bodies both inside and outside the Antarctic Treaty system.
- (360) The Netherlands also supported the recommendations from the ATME especially the recommendation to protect species vulnerable to climate change (Recommendation 25). It also stressed the importance of climate change research in Antarctica.
- (361) Sweden also supported the recommendation to place climate change as a separate item on the agenda and emphasised the importance of Recommendations 21 and 22 relating to climate change related data management and non-native species, respectively.
- (362) Argentina, supported by Ecuador, congratulated SCAR on its excellent ACCE report, and agreed that the issue should be placed as a separate item on the CEP agenda. Argentina also urged the CEP to consider the environmental implications of climate change. Argentina noted that it would carefully consider the recommendations from the ATME including consulting with its scientists.
- (363) Russia reminded Members that references to climate change should refer to long-term changes and, in accordance with WMO standards, should not only consider data observations collected after 1962 but also consider all relevant historical data. It also highlighted the importance of differentiating the impact of climate changes on Antarctica from the role of Antarctica in global climate change trends.
- (364) ASOC drew attention in particular to ATME Recommendations 19, 26, 27 and 28. ASOC also encouraged the CEP to consider a formal mechanism for ensuring that the ATME report could be conveyed to SC-CAMLR, to ensure consideration of the recommendations in that body.
- (365) India also noted the reduction of the carbon footprint of human activities in Antarctica as a high priority for the CEP.
- (366) France, supported by the US, noted that many of the recommendations from the ATME could be readily incorporated into the CEP's current programme of work given that the Committee is already addressing a number of the issues highlighted by the ATME recommendations.
- (367) The United States noted that recommendations from the ATME might ultimately lead towards consideration of other topics. For example, much as climate change has raised concern about potential impacts from non-native species (resulting, for example, in Recommendation 22), climate change is also raising concern about possible extinctions (for example, through the impacts of ocean acidification).
- (368) The SC-CAMLR Observer noted that CCAMLR has climate change on its agenda, and that the matter had been recognised as one of common interest to both Committees at the joint CEP SC-CAMLR workshop in 2009. CCAMLR's particular focus related to understanding the impacts of climate change on its ability to manage the Southern Ocean fishery and to attempt to distinguish the effects of climate change from the effects of fishing. The SC-CAMLR Observer noted that the Scientific Committee had agreed to review its Ecosystem Monitoring Programme (CEMP) to

ensure it was addressing these two objectives. In this regard an opportunity existed to work with the CEP on broader monitoring issues.

- (369) The Committee agreed to prioritise the ATME recommendations and to consider how they might be taken forward. The Committee endorsed Norway's suggestion as to which of the ATME recommendations were pertinent to the CEP and allocated several of these to the relevant CEP agenda items (Appendix 3).
- (370) For those ATME recommendations allocated to agenda item 9a, the Committee discussed these and agreed the following:

Recommendation 4: The ATME recommends that Parties be requested to:

- acknowledge and encourage continuing efforts in developing and exchanging experience of energy efficiency and alternative energy practices so as to promote reduction of the carbon footprint of activities in Antarctica and cut fossil fuel use from stations, vessels, ground transportation and aircraft;
 - solicit from COMNAP a report on progress on the implementation of its Best Practice for Energy Management – Guidance and Recommendations (endorsed by CEP X in Delhi), and ask for an update including details of best practices on energy efficiency and alternative energy deployment;
 - and welcome the efforts of IAATO in working towards developing best practice towards reducing the carbon footprint of its tour ships.
- (371) Consistent with the action in the CEP's five-year work plan, the Committee agreed to request a report from COMNAP on the implementation of its Best Practice Energy Management Guidance.

Recommendation 7: Welcoming the risk assessment approach taken by Australia to identify potential climate change implications for current and future Antarctic infrastructure, logistics and environmental values, the ATME recommends that Parties be encouraged to undertake and report on appropriate risk assessment processes.

- (372) The Committee welcomed the Australian risk assessment approach (reported to CEP XIII in IP 105 *Management implications of climate change in the Antarctic region – an initial Australian assessment*) and recommended that Parties consider undertaking similar exercises.

Recommendation 18: The ATME recommends that ATCM and CEP give consideration to taking a more regional approach in the application of environmental management tools, in addition to the current continent-wide approach.

- (373) The Committee took note of the recommendation and agreed to consider this further at a future meeting.

Recommendation 19: The ATME recommends that the CEP consider developing a climate change response work programme. Such a work programme should attempt to incorporate, *inter alia*:

- The need to continue to afford a high priority to the management of non-native species;
- A classification of existing protected areas according to climate change vulnerability;
- The need for more sophisticated and coordinated ecosystem monitoring, including the need for increased collaboration between CEP and SC-CAMLR;
- A review of existing management tools to assess their continuing suitability in a climate change context (eg, EIA guidelines (particularly with regard to planned long-term activities), Specially Protected Species guidelines, the guide to the preparation of management plans).

- (374) The Committee agreed to place the issue of a climate change work programme on its five-year work plan for attention at a future meeting.

Recommendation 29: The ATME recommends that the CEP remain alert to the development of climate change related conservation tools elsewhere in the world that may also have application in an Antarctic context (eg, climate change adaptation plans, risk assessment tools and mechanisms for assisted translocation of endangered species).

- (375) The Committee took note of this recommendation.

Recommendation 30: The ATME recommends that Parties consider making climate change a separate agenda item on the ATCM and CEP agendas.

- (376) The Committee agreed with the recommendation, noting that it would address the matter under agenda item 14.
- (377) Romania introduced WP 62 *Environmental Monitoring and Ecological Activities in Antarctica* informing the Committee that through the Romanian Polar Research Institute it is participating in the European and International Joint Research Project INTERHEMISPHERE - an interdisciplinary bipolar project involving 12 countries. Romania informed that the principal scientific objectives of the joint research project are related to polar microbiology and ecology, permafrost and polar pedobiology, polar ecology, vegetation and ecological monitoring. Romania informed the CEP that the project will: expand polar monitoring capability of Arctic and Antarctic ecosystem parameters; aid the establishment of databases, and the design of realistic models of polar ecosystems under climate change.
- (378) The Committee congratulated Romania on this initiative and looked forward to learning more of the science outcomes.
- (379) SCAR introduced IP 46 *Antarctic Climate and Change and the Environment - An Update*, noting that it intends to provide regular updates on the Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment (ACCE) report.
- (380) The Committee thanked SCAR for its paper and looked forward to further update reports, noting the importance of a regular flow of information on climate research and the implications for the Antarctic environment to support the ongoing work of the Committee.
- (381) ASOC introduced IP 73 *Key Climate Change Actions in Antarctica: Emissions Reduction, Adaptation and Science*, commenting on the significance of adaptation strategies, and the associated benefits of establishing 'concrete action' especially from recommendations 4, 5 and 29.
- (382) The following additional IPs were submitted under this agenda item:
- IP 34 *Southern Ocean Sentinel: An international Program to assess climate change impacts on marine ecosystems* (Australia)
 - IP 98 *Climate Processes of Ocean, Ice and Atmosphere ERICON AB Icebreaker FP7 project* (Romania)

Advice to the ATCM

- (383) **The Committee undertook a comprehensive review of the report and recommendations from the ATME on Climate Change and Implications for Management and Governance of the Antarctic Region.**
- (384) **The Committee recognised that the implications of climate change cut across many of the issues on the CEP's agenda. The Committee concluded that much of its current work programme addresses many of the issues raised during the ATME.**

- (385) **The Committee agreed to place climate change as a high priority issue on its agenda, and allocated the relevant recommendations from the ATME to the relevant items on the CEP agenda.**
- (386) **The CEP also gave recognition to the need for ongoing work on this issue, in the CEP five year work plan.**
-

b) Other Environmental Monitoring and Reporting Matters

- (387) For those Climate Change ATME recommendations allocated to agenda item 9b (recommendations 14, 15, 21, 27 and 28), the Committee agreed to return to all of these at its next meeting and encouraged Members to give consideration as to how they might be taken forward.
- (388) New Zealand noted that the CEP may want to give urgent attention to ATME Recommendation 27 (on the need for biodiversity assessments) noting that a number of papers, such as WP 3 and SCAR's ACCE report, had highlighted the urgent need for fundamental biodiversity surveys to support environmental management activities in Antarctica.
- (389) The United States drew attention to the information contained in IP 27 rev. 1 *Energy Management Strategies for U.S. Antarctic Research Stations* and noted that it will be presented during the Working Group on Operations.
- (390) Uruguay presented IP 69 *Benthic Marine Invertebrates as a Tool for the Monitoring of Fuel Transfer from Transport Ships in King George Island* and referred to the monitoring of the re fuelling activity by using benthic marine invertebrates as bio indicators aiming to develop an index of biological integrity for the coastal zone of Base Artigas.
- (391) The following papers were also submitted under this agenda item:
- IP 35 *Report of a Joint Oil Spill Exercise: R/V Laurence M. Gould at Rothera Research Station* (United Kingdom and United States)
 - IP 66 *SCAR Data and Information Strategy (DIMS)* (SCAR)
 - IP 121 *Estimación de riesgo al cambio climático y la variabilidad climática, en los ecosistemas terrestres circundantes y en la infraestructura física de la Estación Científica Maldonado* (Ecuador)

Item 10: Inspection Reports

- (392) Norway introduced WP 57 *The 2009 Norwegian Antarctic Inspection under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty*.
- (393) During February 2009, Norway conducted its fourth inspection programme under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty in Dronning Maud Land and Coats Land, inspecting Princess Elisabeth Antarctica (Belgium), Halley Station (United Kingdom), Novolazarevskaya airfield (Russian Federation) and ALCI Airbase (Antarctic Logistics Centre International (ALCI)). The full report of the inspections was provided in IP 30 *Report of the Norwegian Antarctic Inspection under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty. February 2009*.
- (394) Norway reported that inspection Checklist "A" Permanent Antarctic Stations and Associated Installations, appended to Resolution 5 (1995) had proven very useful, and helped make the inspections consistent, as well as providing a basis for comparison. Norway also noted that the inspection team found it very helpful when a pre-completed checklist was provided on arrival.
- (395) Norway's inspection activity had focussed on operations, permitting, safety, scientific research, environment, military activities and tourism. Norway drew the Committee's attention to those issues pertaining to environmental observations.

- (396) In reporting on its inspection of Belgium's Princess Elisabeth Antarctica station, Norway drew the Committee's attention to the innovative, creative and cutting edge design. Norway commented that the station set a precedent in planning and designing an environmentally conscious station in Antarctica.
- (397) Norway reported that good procedures and practices were in place to ensure environmentally well-founded operations at the United Kingdom's Halley V station. Norway noted that energy efficiency had been a priority in the design of the new Halley VI station, soon to replace Halley V. The provision of a pre-completed inspection checklist was very beneficial to the inspection team's work.
- (398) Norway expressed the overall satisfaction of the inspection team with respect to environmental aspects of Novo Runway and ALCI Airbase. Norway noted some potential weaknesses in environmental routines and procedures including waste handling, training and EIA procedures. Norway noted that it had been informed by ALCI, following the inspection, that steps were being taken at ALCI Airbase to address these issues.
- (399) Norway expressed its gratitude for the spirit of commitment and dedication encountered at all the stations visited, and by the openness and friendliness shown to the inspection team.
- (400) France warmly congratulated Norway for this report on the inspection of three contrasting types of operation, including: 1) a station run by a national programme that had been in place for a long time; 2) a new station built to high environmental standards with a complex ownership structure; and 3) a third facility providing a platform for unregulated tourism to Dronning Maud Land. France considered that the inspection report illustrated the nature of new developments in Antarctica and raised some concerns about the consequences of these new developments on environmental and scientific issues.
- (401) Belgium informed the Committee of some new developments relating to Princess Elisabeth Antarctica since the completion of Norway's inspection report. With respect to ownership of the station, Belgium noted that, as of 31 March 2010, ownership of the station had been transferred from the private International Polar Foundation (IPF) to the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office and that the building was now almost exclusively owned by the Belgian State. Belgium further informed the Committee of the recent establishment of the Polar Secretariat, a cooperative structure formed by the Belgian Federal Science Policy Office and the IPF. In response to a reference in IP 30 to a weakness in the station's communication system, Belgium noted that the station's communication facility had not been completed at the time of the inspection. In addition, Belgium informed the Committee that the installation was now complete and fully in-line with current technology.
- (402) South Africa shared the concerns expressed by the inspection team regarding permitting obligations and safety implications in terms of the activities inspected in the DROMLAN area. The service providers were encouraged to obtain IAATO membership and in doing so their activities were appraised by both an IAATO and a South African National Antarctic Programme representative during the past summer season. South Africa is working closely with IAATO in this regard and a meeting with Parties to discuss and review findings will be held in the near future. Given the complexities surrounding this operation, as it also involves the interests of 11 Treaty Parties who utilize the DROMLAN Network, these issues and concerns will be further discussed at the DROMLAN Meeting in Buenos Aires later this year. A Working Paper may be drafted for discussion at the next ATCM.
- (403) IAATO welcomed the Norwegian report as a useful contribution to understanding the complexities of issues in the DROMLAN area. Last year ALCI's sister company, The Antarctic Company (TAC), which deals with tourism activities applied to join IAATO. IAATO welcomed this approach as this provided an opportunity for IAATO to understand the tourist activities taking place in the area. As part of the IAATO Membership assessment IAATO sent an observer to Novo area during the 2009-10 season. An observer's report, with a series of recommendations, had been submitted to IAATO Members for consideration at the next IAATO Annual Meeting after which

Members will vote on TAC's Membership status. IAATO noted with appreciation their discussions with South Africa, Russia and the UK as they work towards achieving clarity on the complexities of this operation and attempt to resolve issues, and appreciates the opportunity for additional discussions going forward.

- (404) The UK congratulated Norway for its reports and was pleased to host the inspection team. Discussion of science at Halley was timely as data gathered there contributed to the discovery of the ozone hole, the 25th Anniversary of which is observed this week. The UK thanked Norway for their comments on Novo Base as it highlighted the need for close cooperation between Treaty Parties to ensure the proper regulation of activities.
- (405) In response to concerns raised over ownership structures at Novo Runway and ALCI Airbase, Russia reminded the Committee that Dronning Maud Land Air Network (DROMLAN) involved a consortium of eleven national programmes and connected Cape Town with Novo Air Base, close to the Russian Novolazarevskaya station. Russia commented that many of these National Programmes relied on logistical support from Novolazarevskaya station which, as a result, appropriated additional environmental pressure and waste. Russia noted that many projects in the Dronning Maud Land region, including the construction of Princess Elisabeth Antarctica, relied on Russia's support.
- (406) ASOC commended Belgium and the United Kingdom on the strong focus they had placed on the environmental design of their new stations. ASOC welcomed the commitment to environmental protection demonstrated by some stations inspected by Norway. While observing that there appeared to be no major environmental concerns identified in Norway's inspection report, ASOC noted that several practices observed were common in Antarctica many years ago.
- (407) The Committee thanked Norway for its report and highlighted the value of inspections conducted under the provisions of the Treaty and Protocol.
- (408) Australia introduced WP 21 *Australian Antarctic Treaty and Environmental Protocol inspections, East Antarctica, 2010*. In January 2010, Australia conducted inspections of Syowa station (Japan), Druzhnaya IV and Soyuz stations (Russian Federation), and Mount Harding (ASPA 168). As provided for under Article VII (4) of the Antarctic Treaty, Australian observers also conducted an aerial observation of Molodezhnaya station (Russian Federation).
- (409) Australia expressed its gratitude to Japan and the Russian Federation for the hospitality and support provided to the team in the conduct of the inspection activity. Australia noted that the inspection team travelled to Antarctica and the inspected stations by air, which, as well as being a new mode of operations for Australian inspections, meant that the support provided was particularly important. Australia noted that its inspection team included members fluent in the languages of each station being inspected, which helped ensure a full understanding of all facets of the operations of the stations visited. Australia also noted its intention to present its final inspection report to Parties at ATCM XXXIV.
- (410) Argentina commended Australia for including inspection team members capable of speaking the language of national programme bases as this leads to more successful inspections.
- (411) ASOC introduced IP 82 *Antarctic Ship-borne Tourism and Inspections under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection*. ASOC asserted that an increase in official inspections under Article VII is warranted, as tourism has become a major Antarctic activity in terms of the number of people, ships, and sites involved.
- (412) ASOC suggested that inspections might focus on tourism vessels, activities, and landing sites rather than primarily on research stations. ASOC further noted that a similar level of scrutiny should be applied in inspections of tourism vessels, activities, and sites, as is applied to national programme facilities. In ASOC's view, existing inspection checklists could be used for the time being, but checklists specific to tourism may eventually be required.
- (413) On this topic, ASOC drew the attention of the Committee to Recommendation 2 from the ATME on the Management of Ship-borne Tourism, in which the ATME participants recommended that

the Treaty Parties should consider the development of a specific checklist for Antarctic Treaty inspections of tourist vessels and tourist activities in Antarctica.

- (414) The Committee thanked ASOC for its paper, noting that it will be considered further under ATCM Agenda Item 11.
- (415) Argentina drew the Committee's attention to work conducted in the intersessional period on the review of inspection Checklist "A" Permanent Antarctic Stations and Associated Installations, appended to Resolution 5 (1995), which will be considered under ATCM Agenda Item 12 (WP 26).
- (416) The other paper submitted under this Agenda item was:
- *IP 5 Inspection undertaken by Japan in accordance with Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article XIV of the Protocol on Environmental Protection (Japan)*

Item 11: Cooperation with Other Organisations

- (417) The SC-CAMLR Observer introduced IP 12 *Report by the SC-CAMLR Observer to the Thirteenth Meeting of the Committee for Environmental Protection* and noted the parallel report WP 7 *Report of the CEP Observer to the twenty-eighth meeting of the Scientific Committee to CCAMLR; 26 – 30 October 2009*. The SC-CAMLR Observer drew the Committee's attention to several matters arising from SC-CAMLR XXVIII, in particular those issues agreed to be of common interest by the joint CEP/SC-CAMLR Workshop held in April 2009 including:
- Climate change
 - Biodiversity and non-native species
 - Species requiring special protection
 - Marine spatial management and protection
 - Ecosystem and environmental monitoring
- (418) The SC-CAMLR Observer welcomed the positive relationship with the CEP and drew attention to some key issues of common interest, noting in particular, SC-CAMLR's review of its CEMP and the opportunity this offered for both SC-CAMLR and CEP to consider their respective monitoring needs. In this regard the SC-CAMLR Observer noted the potential to consider a second Joint CEP/SC-CAMLR workshop and arising from informal discussion between the Chairs, suggested the CEP consider whether such a workshop might be scheduled for 2012 on the theme of monitoring – a subject that is of undoubted interest to the work of both committees and where potential synergies exist.
- (419) The Committee thanked the SC-CAMLR Observer for his report, noting that cooperation with SC-CAMLR will provide the CEP with access to a vast range of expertise and data and that Parties should encourage more participation from the broader scientific community.
- (420) The United States requested that CCAMLR make available on their website a list of areas where CEMP research is currently undertaken.
- (421) Following some discussion the Committee welcomed the suggestion of a joint CEP/SC-CAMLR meeting on monitoring, and encouraged proposals regarding biodiversity and monitoring to be submitted to its next meeting to enable it to prepare for such a workshop. The Committee welcomed the close relationship with SC-CCAMLR, and looked forward to working together in the future.
- (422) Argentina stressed the need to have this workshop in conjunction with an existing meeting of one of these Committees.

- (423) Dr George Watters (United States), convener of the WG-EMM, volunteered to report back to the CEP following the 2010 WG-EMM meeting.
- (424) Dr Polly Penhale (United States) volunteered to take on the role as the CEP Observer to SC-CAMLR.
- (425) The Committee accepted with appreciation the offers of Dr Watters and Dr Penhale.
- (426) An additional paper submitted under this agenda item was:
- IP 88 *Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs (COMNAP) Report to ATCM XXXIII (COMNAP)*

Item 12: General Matters

- (427) Germany introduced IP 110 *Dismantling and subsequent use of Neumayer Station II for SANAP Summer Station and Russian Antarctic Expedition (Germany and South Africa)*, updating the Committee on the dismantling Neumayer Station II in March, 2010. Germany noted that this endeavour represents a joint effort between Germany, Russia, and South Africa. Germany also noted that special attention was paid to carbon emissions during these operations, which had been greatly reduced.
- (428) South Africa thanked Germany for its assistance in providing equipment, technical expertise and support.
- (429) Germany further informed that there is now an established route between the German and South African bases, which allowed for a quick and successful response to an injury earlier in the week.
- (430) ASOC welcomed IP 110 and noted that a number of recent EIAs include plans to remove infrastructure at the end of their lifetime, and noted that it was encouraging to see such actions today.
- (431) Japan thanked Germany and South Africa for their paper and expressed its hope that other Parties will use it as an example for the future. Japan noted that it had participated in an inspection in the Neumayer area and commended Germany for its careful handling of containers and materials. Japan noted that the activities outlined in the paper further demonstrated the importance and benefits of saving resources and energy.
- (432) An additional paper submitted under this agenda item was:
- IP 9 *Belgian Antarctic Research Expedition BELARE 2009-2010*
- (433) The Committee noted that it had been asked by the ATCM to consider the implications of running its meeting from mid-week to mid-week, following the ATCM's consideration as to how it might improve the efficiency of the meetings.
- (434) In discussing the matter, Members raised several issues related to how the efficiency with which CEP meetings are run and managed. Among the points raised it was noted:
- The CEP has over time given significant attention to the way it conducts its business and has already implemented a number of means to increase its efficiency and effectiveness. Such measures include the development of a prioritised five-year work plan, use of intersessional contact groups, development and implementation of an on-line discussion forum, use of workshops ahead of CEP meetings to deal with specific topics, as well as regularly reviewing its agenda and removing or adding issues as appropriate.
 - The CEP receives a large number of papers each year on a range of substantive matters and currently deals with the vast majority of material submitted to any one Antarctic Treaty meeting.
 - Further opportunities to improve the efficiency of the CEP meetings can be considered including the manner in which Information Papers are handled and the amount of time that might be devoted to their consideration (noting that IPs from invited Experts may fall into a

different category), and the need to ensure that WPs have clear recommendations for the CEP to consider, ensuring that all papers meet the deadline for submission and deciding not to consider any papers received after this date.

- (435) On the specific matter of the timing of the CEP meetings and whether the Committee could meet from Wednesday to Tuesday, with a weekend break, the following observations were made:
- It was noted that if this resulted in having more sessions in parallel, costs could be increased if this requires additional interpretation support;
 - It is normal practice for the CEP report to be translated in advance of its presentation to the ATCM, and an altered timing of the CEP meeting may not allow this to happen. Some Members noted that translation of the report assists in the dialogue between the CEP and the ATCM. Others suggested that this was not essential provided it was translated immediately after the meeting.
 - It is not essential, though it is useful, for the CEP and the ATCM to meet in conjunction. Consideration might be given to separating the meetings, though not all Members shared this view.

Item 13: Election of Officers

- (436) Dr Yves Frenot from France was elected to the position of CEP Chair and he was warmly congratulated on his election. The outgoing Chair noted Dr Frenot's significant contributions to the CEP in his past role as Vice-chair. Dr Frenot thanked the Committee and the Chair for their support and kind words.
- (437) The Committee expressed its sincere gratitude and appreciation to the outgoing Chair, Dr Neil Gilbert from New Zealand, for his commitment and enthusiasm, which resulted in excellent guidance for the work of the Committee during the last four years.
- (438) The Committee also re-elected Mr Ewan McIvor from Australia as Vice-chair for a new two-year term. The Chair noted the significant contributions of Mr McIvor to the Committee throughout his last term.

Item 14: Preparation for CEP XIV

- (439) The Committee adopted the provisional agenda for CEP XIV (Appendix 4).
- (440) The Committee made further changes and updates to its prioritised five-year work plan in accordance with the outcomes to CEP XIII (Appendix 5).

Item 15: Adoption of the Report

- (441) The Committee adopted its Report.

Item 16: Closing of the Meeting

- (442) The Chair closed the meeting on Friday 7 May 2010.

ANNEX 1

CEP XIII Agenda and Final List of Documents

Paper No.	Title	Submitted By
------------------	--------------	---------------------

Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

SP 1 rev 2	ATCM XXXIII - CEP XIII Agenda and Schedule	ATS
------------	--	-----

Item 3: Strategic Discussion on the Future Work of the CEP

Item 4: Operation of the CEP

IP 72	Annual Report Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Ukraine
IP 78	Annual report pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty	Italy
SP 9	Electronic Information Exchange System (EIES): Report on the 2nd operational season and summary information examples	ATS

Item 5: Progress to the International Polar Year

WP 11	Forwarding of hydrographic data collected during the IPY	Uruguay
IP 50	The Southern Ocean Observing System (SOOS)	SCAR
IP 99	Young Scientists Fully Aware of the Importance of Antarctic Environment	Romania

Item 6: Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

6a) Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations

WP 59	Answers to comments on CEE for “Water Sampling the Subglacial Lake Vostok”	Russian Federation
IP 6	Update on the Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) of New Indian Research Station at	India

	Larsemann Hills, Antarctica	
--	-----------------------------	--

6b) Other EIA Matters

WP 1	Chairs Report - Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts on the Management of Ship-borne Tourism in the Antarctic Treaty Area	New Zealand
WP 12	Guidelines on Minimising the Impact of Pollution by Light at Antarctic Stations and Ships	United Kingdom
WP 28	Environmental Aspects of Antarctic Ship-borne Tourism	Australia
WP 36	Environmental Aspects and Impacts of Tourism and Non-governmental Activities in Antarctica: Project Report	New Zealand
WP 52	Data Collection and Reporting on Yachting Activity in Antarctica	United States United Kingdom
IP 1	Initial Environmental Evaluation for Development of Approach Path at Proposed New Indian Research Station at Larsemann Hills, East Antarctica	India
IP 13	Continued operation of Kohnen Base as a summer base in Dronning Maud Land including maintenance of a lab in the deep ice by the Alfred Wegener Institute for Polar and Marine Research (AWI)	Germany
IP 24	IAATO Guidelines to Minimize Seabirds Landing on Ships	IAATO
IP 25	IAATO Online Field Staff Assessment & Logbook	IAATO
IP 54	The Republic of Korea's contribution to Antarctic science by installing a new permanent station in Terra Nova Bay, Ross Sea	Korea (ROK)
IP 63	Preliminary Plan for Installation and Operation of the PANSY Atmospheric Radar System at Syowa Station	Japan
IP 75	Non-IAATO Tourism and Visitation in Antarctica	IAATO
IP 79	Tourism and Land-based Facilities in Antarctica: Analysis of a Questionnaire Distributed to Antarctic Treaty Parties at XXXII ATCM	ASOC
IP 104	An Environmental Management System for the Brazilian Antarctic Station "Comandante Ferraz"	Brazil
IP 122	Informe preliminar del Estudio de Impacto Ambiental ex – post de la Estación Científica Pedro Vicente Maldonado	Ecuador

SP 11 rev 1	Annual list of Initial Environmental Evaluations (IEE) and Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEE) prepared between April 1st 2009 and March 31st 2010	ATS
-------------	--	-----

Item 7: Area Protection and Management Plans

7a) Management Plans

WP 10	Guidelines for the Application of Management Zones within Antarctic Specially Managed Areas and Antarctic Specially Protected Areas	United States
WP 18	Revision of maps and text for the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Managed Area No. 7: Southwest Anvers Island & Palmer Basin	United States
WP 19 rev 1	Revised Management Plan for ASPA No. 119 Davis Valley and Forlidas Pond, Dufek Massif, Pensacola Mountains	United States
WP 27	Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 139 Biscoe Point, Anvers Island, Palmer Archipelago	United States
WP 30	Subsidiary Group on Management Plans – Report on Term of Reference #4: Improving Management Plans and the Process for their Intersessional Review	Australia
WP 31	Revision of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPA) No. 105: Beaufort Island, Mc Murdo Sound, Ross Sea	New Zealand
WP 32	Revision of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas No. 155: Cape Evans, Ross Island	New Zealand
WP 33	Revision of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPA) No. 157: Backdoor Bay, Cape Royds, Ross Island	New Zealand
WP 34	Revision of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPA) No. 158: Hut Point, Ross Island	New Zealand
WP 35	Revision of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPA) No. 159: Cape Adare, Borchgrevink Coast	New Zealand
WP 38	Review of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) 101, 102, 103 and 164	Australia

7b) Historic Sites and Monuments

WP 5	Proposed addition of the Plaque Commemorating the PM-3A Nuclear Power Plant at McMurdo Station to the List of Historic Sites and Monument	United States
WP 25	Report of an incident at Wordie House (HSM No. 62)	United Kingdom France Ukraine
WP 47	Proposal for the discussion of aspects related to the management of Historic Sites and Monuments	Argentina
WP 67	Proposed Modification to Historic Site N° 37	Chile
IP 21	Enhancement activities for HSM 38 “Snow Hill”	Argentina
IP 22	Additional information for the discussion of aspects related to the management of Historic Sites and Monuments	Argentina
IP 67	Actualización del estudio de los restos históricos del naufragio de Punta Suffield	Uruguay
IP 93	Conservation and Management of Mawson’s Huts, Cape Denison, King George V Land, ASPA 162, ASMA 4 and HSM 77	Australia

7c) Site Guidelines

WP 17	Antarctic Treaty Visitor Site Guide for Torgersen Island, Arthur Harbor, Southwest Anvers Island	United States
WP 39	Site Guidelines for Danco Island, Errera Channel, Antarctic Peninsula	United Kingdom United States
WP 42	Antarctic Treaty Visitor Site Guidelines for Seabee Hook, Cape Hallett, Northern Victoria Land, Ross Sea	United States
WP 56	Site Guidelines for Damoy Point, Wiencke Island, Antarctic Peninsula	United Kingdom Argentina
WP 64	Site Guidelines for the Northeast beach of Ardley Peninsula (Ardley Island), King George Island (25 de Mayo Island), South Shetland Islands	Argentina Chile
IP 26	Antarctic Site Inventory: 1994-2010	United States
IP 62	Report on IAATO Member use of Antarctic Peninsula Landing Site and ATCM Visitor Site Guidelines - 2008-09 Season	IAATO

7d) Human footprint and wilderness values

WP 23	Assessing cumulative environmental impacts: identifying the distribution and concentration of national operator activities in Antarctica	United Kingdom
WP 29	The concept of Human Footprint in the Antarctic	New Zealand
IP 20	Possible human impact on Deception Island	Spain
IP 48	Topic Summary: Footprint	Australia
IP 49	The concept of Human Footprint in the Antarctic	New Zealand
IP 81	Coastal Hydrocarbon Pollution: A Case Study From Deception Island, Antarctica	ASOC

7e) Marine Spatial Protection and Management

IP 32	Identificación y evaluación de la acción antrópica de grupos poblacionales de mamíferos marinos pinnípedos en áreas de la costa del Estrecho de Drake	Uruguay
IP 45	Terra Nova Bay – Wood Bay Marine Protected Area inside a wider proposal for a Ross Sea MPA	Italy
IP 58	Designation of a new Marine Protected Area for the South Orkney Islands southern shelf	United Kingdom
IP 77	The Case for Inclusion of the Ross Sea Continental Shelf and Slope in a Southern Ocean Network of Marine Reserves	ASOC
IP 83	Rising to the challenge: Key steps to deliver a Comprehensive and Representative Marine Protected Areas Network in the Southern Ocean by 2012	ASOC
IP 107	Bioregionalisation and Spatial Ecosystem Processes in the Ross Sea Region	New Zealand

7f) Other Annex V Matters

WP 3	Biodiversity-based Evaluation of the Environmental Domains Analysis	SCAR
WP 16	The Implications of Climate Change for the Antarctic Protected Areas System	United Kingdom
WP 40	Third Progress Report on the Discussion of the International Working Group about Possibilities for Environmental Management of Fildes Peninsula and Ardley Island	Chile Germany
WP 54	Enhancing the Antarctic Protected Areas Database to help assess and further develop the protected areas system	Australia

IP 2	Spatial Patterns of Tour Ship Traffic in the Antarctic Peninsula Region	United States IAATO
IP 71	Progress on Designation of Broad-scale Management System in the Vernadsky Station Area	Ukraine

Item 8: Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna

8a) Quarantine and non-native species

WP 4	Preliminary Results from the International Polar Year Programme: Aliens in Antarctica	SCAR
WP 6	Current knowledge for reducing risks posed by terrestrial non-native species: towards an evidence-based approach	SCAR Australia
WP 8	Draft procedures for vehicle cleaning to prevent transfer of non-native species into and around Antarctica	United Kingdom
WP 9	Open-ended Intersessional Contact Group on “Non-Native Species” (NNS) - 2009-2010 Report	France
WP 14	Intra-regional transfer of species in terrestrial Antarctica	United Kingdom
WP 15	Guidance for visitors and environmental managers following the discovery of a suspected non-native species in the terrestrial and freshwater Antarctic environment	United Kingdom
IP 14	Research Project “The role of human activities in the introduction of non-native species into Antarctica and in the distribution of organisms within the Antarctic”	Germany
IP 42	Colonisation status of known non-native species in the Antarctic terrestrial environment	United Kingdom
IP 43	Eradication of a vascular plant species recently introduced to Whaler’s Bay, Deception Island	United Kingdom Spain
IP 44	Suggested framework and considerations for scientists attempting to determine the colonisation status of newly discovered terrestrial or freshwater species within the Antarctic Treaty Area	United Kingdom

8b) Specially Protected Species

8c) Other Annex II Matters

IP 41	Southern giant petrel monitoring in ASPA 167, Hawker	Australia
-------	--	-----------

	Island, using automated cameras	
IP 47	Census of Antarctic Marine Life (CAML)	SCAR Australia
IP 117	Biodiversidad Microbiológica y Aplicaciones Biotecnológicas	Ecuador
IP 118	Aislamiento e Identificación de Bacterias Antárticas Capaces de Biodegradar Hidrocarburos	Ecuador

Item 9: Environmental Monitoring and Reporting

9a) Climate Change

WP 62	Environmental Monitoring and Ecological Activities in Antarctica, 2010-2012	Romania
WP 63	Report from Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts on Implications of Climate Change for Antarctic Management and Governance. Co-chairs' executive summary with advice for actions	Norway United Kingdom
IP 34	Southern Ocean Sentinel: an international program to assess climate change impacts on marine ecosystems	Australia
IP 46	Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment – An Update	SCAR
IP 73	Key Climate Change Actions in Antarctica: Emissions Reduction, Adaptation and Science	ASOC
IP 98	Climate Processes of Ocean, Ice and Atmosphere - ERICON AB Icebreaker FP7 Project	Romania
IP 105	Management implications of climate change in the Antarctic region – an initial Australian assessment	Australia

9b) Other Environmental Monitoring and Reporting Matters

IP 27 rev 1	Energy Management Strategies for U.S. Antarctic Research Stations	United States
IP 35	Report of a Joint Oil Spill Exercise: RV Laurence M. Gould at Rothera Research Station	United Kingdom United States
IP 66	SCAR Data and Information Strategy (DIMS)	SCAR
IP 69	Benthic Marine Invertebrates as a Tool for the Monitoring of Fuel Transfer from Transport Ships in King George Island	Uruguay

IP 121	Estimación de riesgo al cambio climático y la variabilidad climática, en los ecosistemas terrestres circundantes y en la infraestructura física de la Estación Científica Maldonado	Ecuador
--------	---	---------

Item 10: Inspection Reports

WP 21	Australian Antarctic Treaty and Environmental Protocol inspections, East Antarctica, 2010	Australia
WP 57	The 2009 Norwegian Antarctic Inspection under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty	Norway
IP 5	Inspection undertaken by Japan in accordance with Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article XIV of the Protocol on Environmental Protection	Japan
IP 30	Report of the Norwegian Antarctic Inspection under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty. February 2009	Norway
IP 82	Antarctic Ship-borne Tourism and Inspections Under Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article 14 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection	ASOC

Item 11: Cooperation with Other Organisations

WP 7	Report of the CEP Observer to the twenty-eighth meeting of the Scientific Committee to CCAMLR; 26 – 30 October 2009	New Zealand
IP 12	Report by the SC-CAMLR Observer to the Thirteenth Meeting of the Committee for Environmental Protection	CCAMLR
IP 88	Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs (COMNAP) Report to ATCM XXXIII	COMNAP

Item 12: General Matters

IP 9	Belgian Antarctic Research Expedition BELARE 2009-2010	Belgium
IP 110	Dismantling and subsequent use of Neumayer Station II for SANAP Summer Station and Russian Antarctic Expedition	Germany South Africa

Item 13: Election of Officers

Item 14: Preparation for Next Meeting

Item 15: Adoption of the Report

Item 16: Closing of the Meeting

Appendix 1: Revised Terms of Reference for the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans

The CEP's proposal to establish a Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP) was approved by ATCM XXXI in 2008 (Final Report paragraph 94) and the SGMP's Terms of Reference were outlined in Appendix 3 to the CEP XI Report. At that time it was agreed that the CEP should review the effectiveness of the SGMP after a two-year period, and revise the terms of reference as necessary. CEP XIII conducted such a review, and determined that SGMP had been effective in its carrying out its role of developing advice to the CEP on draft management plans referred for intersessional review and on improving management plans and the process for their intersessional review. Following a proposal by the SGMP (outlined in ATCM XXXIII/WP 30), CEP XIII agreed to include an additional Terms of Reference for the group, as follows.

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 5¹, and with relevant CEP guidelines;²
 - its content, clarity, consistency and likely effectiveness;³
 - whether it clearly states the primary reason for designation;⁴ and
 - whether it clearly states how the proposed Area complements the Antarctic protected areas system as a whole.⁵
- 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.
- 5) Develop and suggest procedures that would assist in achieving a long-term goal aiming at ensuring that all ASPA and ASMA management plans contain adequate content, and are clear, consistent and likely to be effective.⁶

¹ Modified from "Terms of Reference for an Intersessional Contact Group to Consider draft Management Plans" ToR #2 (CEP VII Report, Annex 4).

² Currently including – for ASPAs – Resolution 2 (1998) *Guide for the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas* and Resolution 1 (2000) *Guidelines for Implementation of the Framework for Protected Areas set forth in Article 3, Annex V of the Environmental Protocol*.

³ From "Guidelines for CEP Consideration of New and Revised Draft ASPA and ASMA Management Plans" paragraph 8 (CEP VI Report, Annex 4), and "Terms of Reference for an Intersessional Contact Group to Consider draft Management Plans" ToR #2 (CEP VII Report, Annex 4).

⁴ Agreement at CEP VIII (Report paragraph 187).

⁵ Agreement at CEP VIII (Report paragraph 187).

⁶ Term of Reference added at CEP XIII (Report paragraph 162)

Appendix 2. Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP) Work Plan

Terms of Reference (ToR)	2010/11 intersessional period	2011/12 intersessional period (provisional tasks)
<i>ToR 1 to 3</i>	Review draft management plan for ASPA 126 Byers Peninsula (see ATCM XXXIII/WP 43) and provide advice to proponents and the CEP	Review draft management plans referred by CEP for intersessional review and provide advice to proponents and the CEP
<i>ToR 4</i>	Review and update SGMP work plan	Review and update SGMP work plan
	Finalise suggested standard wording and template for management plans	
	Review and commence revision of <i>Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas</i> , including to incorporate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • suggested standard wording and template for management plans (see ATCM XXXIII/WP 30); • guidelines for the application of management zones (see ATCM XXXIII/WP 10); • cross-references to the guidelines appended to Resolution 1 (2000) (see ATCM XXXIII/WP 51); • guidance regarding climate change considerations for management plans (see ATCM XXXIII/WP 63, Recommendation 19); • guidance on preventing the introduction of non-native species (see ATCM XXXIII/WP 9, Annex III, Item 3); and • other appropriate modifications. 	Complete revision of <i>Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas</i> .
	Further planning for workshop to share best practice in ASMA management and develop <i>Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Managed Areas</i>	
<i>ToR 5</i>	Invite those Parties responsible for Type 2, 3 and 4 plans to provide information about the review status and timeframe, as basis for further prioritization	Commence review of management plans overdue for five-yearly review
<i>Working Papers</i>	Prepare report for CEP against SGMP ToR 1 to 3	Prepare report for CEP against SGMP ToR 1 to 3 and ToR 5
	Prepare report for CEP against SGMP ToR 4 and 5*	Prepare report for CEP against SGMP ToR 4

Appendix 3: Recommendations from the Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts on Climate Change

ATME Recommendation	Agenda
<u>Recommendation 1:</u> The ATME recommends that the ATCM acknowledge and welcome the SCAR ACCE report as an important resource for its own deliberations and as an input to the wider global climate negotiations, eg, the UNFCCC.	
<u>Recommendation 2:</u> The ATME recommends that the ATCM considers developing an Antarctic climate change communication plan to bring the findings of the ACCE report to the attention of other decision makers, the general public and the media.	
<u>Recommendation 3:</u> The ATME recommends that the ATCM consider how best to provide information about Antarctic climate change to fora discussing and negotiating global climate change.	
<p><u>Recommendation 4:</u> The ATME recommends that Parties be requested to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • acknowledge and encourage continuing efforts in developing and exchanging experience of energy efficiency and alternative energy practices so as to promote reduction of the carbon footprint of activities in Antarctica and cut fossil fuel use from stations, vessels, ground transportation and aircraft; • solicit from COMNAP a report on progress on the implementation of its Best Practice for Energy Management – Guidance and Recommendations (endorsed by CEP X in Delhi), and ask for an update including details of best practices on energy efficiency and alternative energy deployment; and • welcome the efforts of IAATO in working towards developing best practice towards reducing the carbon footprint of its tour ships. 	CEP 9a
<u>Recommendation 5:</u> Recognizing the importance of emission cuts in Antarctica and their symbolic value in the global context, the ATME recommends that the ATCM encourage COMNAP to work with national programmes to use consistent methods to quantify and publish savings made by energy efficiencies, and which contribute to both (a) reducing carbon footprint, and (b) reducing fuel consumption and operating costs.	
<u>Recommendation 6:</u> The ATME recommend that Parties be advised to use atmospheric models to evaluate the wind regimes around their individual stations, to determine the potential for wind power as a means of cutting fuel costs and greenhouse gas emissions.	
<u>Recommendation 7:</u> Welcoming the risk assessment approach taken by Australia to identify potential climate change implications for current and future Antarctic infrastructure, logistics and environmental values, the ATME recommends that Parties be encouraged to undertake and report on appropriate risk assessment processes.	CEP 9a
<u>Recommendation 8:</u> In developing EIAs for new facilities, the ATME recommends that Parties be requested to take climate change considerations into account.	CEP 6b
<u>Recommendation 9:</u> Noting that the WMO Executive Council Panel of Experts on Polar Observations, Research and Services, promotes and coordinates relevant programmes carried out in the polar regions, the ATME recommends that the Panel and others be urged to increase the refinement of Antarctic climate models, and the WMO be invited to provide regular reports to the ATCM to update Parties on progress with outcomes of the Committee’s activities.	
<u>Recommendation 10:</u> The ATME recommends that Parties be advised to expand research that will refine and enhance our ability to predict future climate change with increasing accuracy on various temporal and geographical scales; and to encourage steps to link scientific research efforts to the activities of operational agencies involved in providing climate services and other related activities.	
<u>Recommendation 11:</u> Given that the IPY has been very successful in significantly increasing the volume and interdisciplinary character of polar research, especially in relation to understanding climate change, the ATME recommends that national agencies be urged to maintain the momentum of that research as a key contribution to the IPY legacy.	CEP 5

ATME Recommendation	Agenda
<u>Recommendation 12:</u> The ATME recommends that Parties be requested to encourage the collaboration required to develop comprehensive and advanced integrated Earth System models capable of producing outputs at decadal scales and regional scales that can be used to assess the likelihood, timing and amplitude of climate change.	
<u>Recommendation 13:</u> The ATME recommends that Parties be requested to encourage the space agencies to continue coordinated observations of the Antarctic region from space, in the context of improving the operation of observing systems for climate change, and to attend a future ATCM to give a demonstration of the use of modern space-based technologies for observing the Antarctic region in the context of climate change.	
<u>Recommendation 14:</u> The ATME recommends that Parties be requested to continue to strongly encourage collaboration and development of sustained integrated observing systems using <i>in situ</i> , air and space-based techniques.	CEP 9b
<u>Recommendation 15:</u> Recognizing that Parties are obliged under the Treaty to share scientific data and information, and that there is a great deal to be gained from working more closely together on the collection of observations of climate change and its effects, the ATME recommends that Parties be requested to encourage greater collaboration in such collections, and to support access to such data through the Antarctic Master Directory.	CEP 9b
<u>Recommendation 16:</u> The ATME recommends that Parties be requested to encourage national operators and SCAR to seek close cooperation and synergies with existing climate observing and assessment initiatives such as the Global Climate Observing System (GCOS) and the IPCC.	
<u>Recommendation 17:</u> The ATME recommends that the ATCM encourages SCAR to incorporate identification of key regions, habitats and species at greatest risk from climate change effects into its research programmes.	CEP 8c
<u>Recommendation 18:</u> The ATME recommends that ATCM and CEP give consideration to taking a more regional approach in the application of environmental management tools, in addition to the current continent-wide approach.	CEP 9a
<p><u>Recommendation 19:</u> The ATME recommends that the CEP consider developing a climate change response work programme. Such a work programme should attempt to incorporate, <i>inter alia</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need to continue to afford a high priority to the management of non-native species; • A classification of existing protected areas according to climate change vulnerability; • The need for more sophisticated and coordinated ecosystem monitoring, including the need for increased collaboration between CEP and SC-CAMLR; • A review of existing management tools to assess their continuing suitability in a climate change context (eg, EIA guidelines (particularly with regard to planned long-term activities), Specially Protected Species guidelines, the guide to the preparation of management plans). 	CEP 9a
<u>Recommendation 20:</u> The ATME recommends that the ATCM and CEP encourage national Antarctic programmes to undertake marine and terrestrial biodiversity surveys and to submit, as a matter of urgency, all relevant biodiversity data to appropriate databases (eg, the Biodiversity Database). In conducting such surveys, priority attention should be paid to regions considered to be at high risk of climate change impacts as well as to existing protected areas established to protect biological values.	CEP 8c
<u>Recommendation 21:</u> The ATME recommends that the CEP give consideration as to means for improving climate change related data and information management to support its environmental management responsibilities.	CEP 9b

ATME Recommendation	Agenda
<p><u>Recommendation 22:</u> The ATME recommends that the CEP consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • using established methods of identifying a) Antarctic environments at high risk from establishment by non-natives and b) non-native species that present a high risk of establishment in Antarctica; • implementing non-native species monitoring protocols at areas of high risk, as well as at protected areas; • developing decision making tools to aid responses to identified establishments of non-native species. 	CEP 8a
<p><u>Recommendation 23:</u> The ATME recommends that Parties be encouraged to comprehensively and consistently implement management measures to respond to the environmental implications of climate change, particularly measures to avoid introduction and translocation of non-native species, and to report on their effectiveness.</p>	CEP 8a
<p><u>Recommendation 24:</u> The ATME recommends that CEP review the means of applying protected and managed area management tools to ensure sufficient flexibility to account for climate change effects. Such a review should consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the need to ensure that climate change effects are assessed during each five-yearly review of management plans, including for example, the need to establish protected and managed area boundaries that are climate change resilient; and • the potential to delist sites at which the original values to be protected have been lost or degraded. 	CEP 7f
<p><u>Recommendation 25:</u> The ATME recommends that the CEP consider a systematic approach to protected or managed areas to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • protect species, or habitats identified to be of particular risk to climate change consequences (cf. Recommendation 18); • accommodate areas that have potential to be environmental or climate refuges; • set aside areas for future climate change related research, including reference areas. 	CEP 7f
<p><u>Recommendation 26:</u> The ATME recommends, recognising the responsibilities of and need to coordinate with CCAMLR, that the CEP consider, and advise the ATCM accordingly, as to means by which automatic interim protection might be afforded to newly exposed areas, such as marine areas exposed through ice-shelf collapse.</p>	CEP 7f,
<p><u>Recommendation 27:</u> The ATME recommends that the CEP and SC-CAMLR be encouraged to ensure that sufficiently frequent biodiversity surveys and adequate monitoring programmes are established to provide an understanding of climate change induced responses in species distribution and abundance.</p>	CEP 9b
<p><u>Recommendation 28:</u> The ATME recommends that CEP and SC-CAMLR continue to develop means for collecting and sharing data and information on the status and trends of species of interest to both bodies (eg, seals, penguins and seabirds), including the need to cooperate with other experts bodies such as SCAR and ACAP.</p>	CEP 9b
<p><u>Recommendation 29:</u> The ATME recommends that the CEP remain alert to the development of climate change related conservation tools elsewhere in the world that may also have application in an Antarctic context (eg, climate change adaptation plans, risk assessment tools and mechanisms for assisted translocation of endangered species).</p>	CEP 9a
<p><u>Recommendation 30:</u> The ATME recommends that Parties consider making climate change a separate agenda item on the ATCM and CEP agendas.</p>	CEP 9a

Appendix 4

Provisional Agenda for CEP XIV

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. Climate Change Implications for the Environment: Strategic approach
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. Human footprint and wilderness values
 - e. Marine Spatial Protection and Management
 - f. Other Annex V Matters
8. Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna
 - a. Quarantine and Non-native Species
 - b. Specially Protected Species
 - c. Other Annex II Matters
9. Environmental Monitoring and Reporting
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 5. CEP Five Year Work Plan

		Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the Intersessional periods (subject to annual review)									
Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	Inter- sessional Period	CEP XIV 2011	Inter- sessional Period	CEP XV 2012	Inter- sessional Period	CEP XVI 2013	Inter- sessional Period	CEP XVII 2014	Inter- sessional Period	CEP XVIII 2015
Introduction of non-native species	1	ICG to continue as per revised work plan Further review of guidance (ref ATCM XXXIII/WP15)	Consider report from the ICG and progress with NNS manual	Progress with further work requirements identified by ICG		Progress with further work requirements identified by ICG		Progress with further work requirements identified by ICG		Progress with further work requirements identified by ICG	Review non-native species manual
Actions: 1. Develop practical guidelines / standards / norms for all Antarctic operators. 2. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME			Consider revised guidance								
Tourism and NGO activities	1	Tourism study overseen by project management group	Tourism study reviewed and forwarded to the ATCM		Ongoing consideration of ATME outcomes under relevant agenda items						
Actions: 1. Provide advice to ATCM as requested. 2. Advance recommendations from ship-borne tourism ATME			Ongoing consideration of ATME outcomes under relevant agenda items								
Global Pressure: Climate change	1		Ongoing consideration of ATME outcomes under relevant agenda items		Ongoing consideration of ATME outcomes under relevant agenda items		Standing agenda item		Standing agenda item		Standing agenda item
Actions: 1. Consider implications of climate change for management of Antarctic environment 2. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME											

**Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the Intersessional periods
(subject to annual review)**

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XIV 2011	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XV 2012	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVI 2013	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVII 2014	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVIII 2015
Processing new and revised protected / managed area management plans	1	SGMP conducts work as per agreed work plan (ref CEP XIII Final report)	Consideration of SGMP report	SGMP / conducts work as per agreed work plan	Consideration of SGMP / report	SGMP / conducts work as per agreed work plan	Consideration of SGMP / report	SGMP / conducts work as per agreed work plan	Consideration of SGMP / report	SGMP / conducts work as per agreed work plan	
Actions: 1. Refine the process for reviewing new and revised management plans. 2. Update existing guidelines. 3. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME											
Marine spatial protection and management	1	1. Send relevant papers to WG EMM (26 Jul-3 August, Cape Town). 2. CEP Observer to attend WG-EMM 3. CEP ASMA workshop to consider application of ASMA concept to marine management.	Review CEP Observer reports to WG-EMM and SC-CAMLR	1. Send relevant papers to SC-CAMLR MPA workshop (Jul or Aug 2011). 2. CEP Observer to attend MPA Workshop and WG-EMM	Review CEP Observer reports to WG-EMM, MPA workshop and SC-CAMLR						
Actions: 1. Cooperate with CCAMLR on Southern Ocean bioregionalisation. 2. Identify processes for MPA designation. 3. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME.											

**Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the Intersessional periods
(subject to annual review)**

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XIV 2011	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XV 2012	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVI 2013	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVII 2014	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVIII 2015
Operation of the CEP and Strategic Planning	1		<p align="center">Standing item</p> <p>Review and revise work plan as appropriate</p>		<p align="center">Standing item</p> <p>Review and revise work plan as appropriate</p>		<p align="center">Standing item</p> <p>Review and revise work plan as appropriate</p>		<p align="center">Standing item</p> <p>Review and revise work plan as appropriate</p>		<p align="center">Standing item</p> <p>Review and revise work plan as appropriate</p>
Human footprint / wilderness management	2	Consideration by interested Parties	<p>Review future actions based on intersessional work</p> <p>Secretariat summary report of information exchanged on inventory of past activities</p>				<p align="center">Agreement on terms 'footprint' and 'wilderness'</p>				

**Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the Inter-Sessional periods
(subject to annual review)**

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XIV 2011	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XV 2012	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVI 2013	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVII 2014	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVIII 2015
Maintain the list of Historic Sites and Monuments	2	Inter-Sessional discussion of HSM 37	Standing item		Standing item		Standing item		Standing item		Standing item
Actions: 1. Maintain the list and consider new proposals as they arise.											
Monitoring and state of the environment reporting	2		Report from SCAR regarding SC-ADM support for CEP work								
Actions: 1. Identify key environmental indicators 2. Establish a process for reporting to the ATCM 3. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME											

**Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the Intersessional periods
(subject to annual review)**

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XIV 2011	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XV 2012	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVI 2013	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVII 2014	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVIII 2015
Exchange of Information	2	Commence 100% use of EIES	Secretariat Report		Secretariat Report		Secretariat Report		Secretariat Report		Secretariat Report
Actions: 1. Assign to the Secretariat.											
Biodiversity knowledge	2										
Actions: 1. Maintain awareness of threats to existing biodiversity. 2. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME											

**Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the Inter-Sessional periods
(subject to annual review)**

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	<i>Inter-Sessional Period</i>	CEP XIV 2011	<i>Inter-Sessional Period</i>	CEP XV 2012	<i>Inter-Sessional Period</i>	CEP XVI 2013	<i>Inter-Sessional Period</i>	CEP XVII 2014	<i>Inter-Sessional Period</i>	CEP XVIII 2015
Site specific guidelines for tourist-visited sites	2	Continue ICG to review Recommendation XVIII-1	Review ICG work. Make recommendations to ATCM Plan future work on basis of ICG work								
Actions: 1. Review site specific guidelines as required. 2. Provide advice to ATCM as required.											
Implementing and improving the EIA provisions of Annex I	3	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	Consideration of ICG report on draft CEE, as required
Actions: 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. 5. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME											

**Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the Intersessional periods
(subject to annual review)**

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XIV 2011	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XV 2012	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVI 2013	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVII 2014	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVIII 2015
Specially protected species	3										
Actions: 1. Consider listing / de-listing proposals as required.											
Overview of the protected areas system / EDA	3								Discuss possible implications of an updated gap analysis based on EDA		
Actions: 1. Apply the Environmental Domains Analysis (EDA) to enhance the protected areas system. 2. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME											
Emergency response action and contingency planning	3		Review outcomes of ATCM XXXIII consideration of ATME report								
Actions: 1. Advance recommendations from ship-borne tourism ATME											

**Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the Intersessional periods
(subject to annual review)**

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XIV 2011	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XV 2012	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVI 2013	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVII 2014	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVIII 2015
Updating the Protocol and reviewing Annexes	3						Requires CEP discussion on the need and aims for reviewing Protocol annexes				
Actions: 1. Prepare a prioritized timetable for the review of the remaining annexes.											
Inspections (Article 14 of the Protocol)	3		Standing item		Standing item		Standing item		Standing item		Standing item
Actions: 1. Review inspection reports as required.											
Energy management	4				COMNAP report presented to CEP – dedicated time for discussion						
Actions: 1. Develop best-practice guidelines for energy management at stations and bases.											

**Timetable for actions to be addressed at CEP meetings and during the Intersessional periods
(subject to annual review)**

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XIV 2011	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XV 2012	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVI 2013	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVII 2014	<i>Inter- sessional Period</i>	CEP XVIII 2015
Outreach and education	4								Dedicated time for discussion		
Actions: 1. Review current examples and identify opportunities for greater education and outreach.											
Waste	5								COMNAP report requested		COMNAP report presented to CEP – dedicated time for discussion
Actions: 1. Develop guidelines for best practice disposal of waste including human waste.											
Clean up of sites of past activity	5		Secretariat summary report of information exchanged on inventory of past activities								Secretariat requested to develop and maintain an inventory COMNAP report on best practice requested
Actions: 1. Establish Antarctic-wide inventory of sites of past activity. 2. Develop guidelines for best practice approach to clean up.											