

**Report of the Committee
For Environmental Protection
(CEP XIV)**

Buenos Aires, June 20-24 2011

Item 1: Opening of the Meeting

1. The CEP Chair, Dr Yves Frenot, opened the meeting on Monday 20 June 2011 and thanked Argentina for arranging and hosting the meeting in Buenos Aires.
2. The Chair recalled the various significant anniversaries being celebrated at the ATCM XXXIV, including the 20th anniversary of the opening for signature of the Madrid Protocol in 1991. He also offered his condolences for the loss of Ambassador Jorge Berguño (Chile) and Dr Teodor Negoită (Romania), both valued members of the Antarctic community.
3. The Chair summarised the work undertaken during the intersessional period. This included four intersessional contact groups (among them two for the evaluation of draft CEEs circulated during the period), one workshop and other studies contributing to the papers before CEP XIV. Most of the planned work decided at the end of CEP XIII were achieved.

Item 2: Adoption of the Agenda

4. The Committee adopted the following agenda and confirmed the allocation of 46 Working Papers, 68 Information Papers and 4 Secretariat 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. 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
5. The Chair drew attention to the continuous increase in the extent and volume of the CEP Final Reports with each meeting. He proposed to reduce the size of this report by focussing on the key issues discussed, the decisions taken, and the Committee's advice to the ATCM, as well as future work targets.

Item 3 Strategic Discussions on the Future Work of the CEP

6. ASOC introduced IP 89 Rev1 *The Antarctic Environmental Protocol, 1991-2011*. While noting the Protocol's many achievements, ASOC raised concerns that the Protocol is not consistently applied by all Parties and that some of its more innovative and progressive aspects of environmental management, such as international collaboration, EIA for all activities, and dependent and associated ecosystems, are much less adequately realised than might be expected. ASOC recommended that a better and more consistent implementation of the Protocol's letter and intent is required, including greater transparency in national implementation, and a greater commitment to international management of the Antarctic region.
7. The Committee noted the value of independent reviews and thanked ASOC for its paper, which was a useful reference for new reflections on the continued work of the CEP, including through its five-year work plan. Some Members noted that IP 89 Rev 1 could form the basis for a possible review of the implementation of the Protocol in 2016 at the 25th anniversary of the Protocol. It was also suggested that it would be a useful document for assisting Parties in assessing internally how well they were performing with respect to the Protocol objectives.
8. During this discussion, the Russian Federation reminded the Committee of the importance of the consistent application of EIAs, and offered to work with interested Parties.
9. The Committee revised and updated the Five-Year Work Plan (Appendix 3).

Item 4: Operation of the CEP

10. The Chair noted that the two Working Papers to be presented under this Agenda Item were also submitted for discussion by the Legal and Institutional Working Group.

11. The United States introduced WP 25, jointly elaborated with Germany, entitled *Timely Submission of Papers in Advance of ATCMs*, which aimed to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of ATCM and CEPs work, by including in the Rules of Procedure clear rules related to submission of papers in advance of ATCMs.
12. Australia presented WP 36, co-authored with France and New Zealand, entitled *A proposed new approach to the handling of Information Papers*. This paper was intended to improve the efficiency of meetings by modifying the procedures for handling of Information Papers, including to provide that papers not material to discussions under the ATCM / CEP agenda be made available only via the ATS website and not be circulated or introduced during the meeting.
13. These documents were not discussed in detail by the Committee and were addressed by the Legal and Institutional Working Group.
14. The United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) introduced IP 113 *Review of the Implementation of the Madrid Protocol: Annual Report by Parties (Article 17)*, jointly submitted with ASOC. UNEP emphasised that the level of compliance in the production of annual reports on the implementation of the Protocol remained low even twelve years after ratification.
15. Many Members agreed that the level of compliance required considerable improvement and reiterated that all Parties should submit their annual reports. Some Members pointed out that the platform to do so, the Electronic Information Exchange System (EIES), could be more user-friendly.
16. The Secretariat agreed to convene an informal contact group on the CEP Discussion Forum to coordinate technical proposals from Members on this matter.
17. Other papers submitted under this agenda item were:
 - IP 71 (Italy): *Annual Report pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty. 2009-2010*
 - IP 93 (Ukraine): *Annual Report Pursuant to Article 17 of the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty*

Item 5: Climate Change Implications for the Environment: Strategic Approach

18. The United Kingdom introduced a joint paper with Norway, WP 44 *Progress Report on ATME on Climate Change*, which tracked actions on the conclusions and recommendations arising from the *2010 Antarctic Treaty Meeting of Experts on Climate Change (ATME Climate Change)*.
19. SCAR informed the Committee that it had already incorporated Recommendation 17 on the identification of key regions, habitats and species at greatest risk from climate change effects of the ATME into its research programmes.
20. South Africa noted that the impact of climate change on biodiversity is one of its key current Antarctic research challenges.
21. Australia noted that the ATME recommendations may be best managed by incorporating them into relevant aspects of the Committee's business, including the five-year work plan. It noted that combining or grouping the recommendations by subject matter (e.g. non-native species, area protection) could assist with such an approach.
22. Several Members considered that such a framework like the one proposed in WP 44 would be a useful tool to inform the management activities of the CEP through its five-year work plan.

23. IAATO referred to IP 103 *IAATO's Climate Change Working Group: Report on Progress* and stated that it would continue to provide information to the CEP on this work and raise awareness of climate change in the Antarctic to other interested Members, noting the successful collaboration with SCAR earlier this year.
24. CCAMLR added that its Scientific Committee had considered ATME Recommendations 19, 26, 28 and 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, and agreed that future Working Groups should continue to focus on ecosystem management. CCAMLR also noted its continued participation in the Committee with the submission of IP 31 *Report by the SC-CAMLR Observer to the Fourteenth Meeting of the Committee for Environmental Protection*.
25. COMNAP remarked that ATME Recommendations 4 and 5 that refer directly to COMNAP, had been addressed in IP8 *COMNAP Energy Management Workshop*, to be discussed under ATCM Item 13. COMNAP is able to provide updates ATME Recommendations 4 and 5 to include in this progress report.
26. The Committee agreed to task the Secretariat to update on a regular basis the summary table at Annex A of the WP 44, recording the actions *vis à vis* each of the 30 ATME recommendations, by both the CEP and the ATCM.
27. The United Kingdom introduced first steps towards developing a simple and rapid assessment of vulnerability of 12 ASPAs to climate change (WP 43 *Developing a Single Methodology for Classifying Antarctic Specially Protected Areas According to their Vulnerability to Climate Change jointly submitted by the United Kingdom and Norway*). The United Kingdom explained that this paper assessed possible impacts in terms of two components: vulnerability of their key values and regional exposure to climate change. The United Kingdom drew attention to two of the most vulnerable of these 12 ASPAs to emerge from the analysis, namely ASPA 107 Dion Islands and ASPA 151 Lions Rump.
28. India congratulated the United Kingdom for this excellent paper but raised concerns that there was a bias towards only assessing the impacts on the biology and vegetation of the ASPAs rather than a more general biodiversity approach. It suggested that the assessment lacked information on mineral species or glacial retreat and how such threats in these cases might be identified.
29. The USA noted that the methodology had promise, but would benefit from implementing the ecosystem approach, rather than the simpler approach of focusing on a single species or a single ASPA characteristic in placing the ASPA in the matrix. This could be included in the Five-Year Work Plan for the CEP.
30. Argentina agreed with the US views, and suggested that the preliminary variables proposed by WP 43 were too different in terms of spatial scale (regional vs. ASPA area) and weight. Therefore, in Argentina's opinion, this matrix needs more refinement.
31. Australia noted that the methodology proposed by the United Kingdom and Norway could be combined with an understanding of the impacts of local activities to better understand the risks to protected areas and the values they are designated to protect. It further noted that such a methodology could assist with identifying and protecting areas that are of scientific value as climate change reference sites or as sites to observe and track climate change.
32. Argentina, Chile, Germany, South Africa, France and ASOC all supported further work to develop the range and comparability of variables in such a project.
33. New Zealand, thanking the United Kingdom and Norway for these very helpful papers, noted the important role that protected areas will play in building resilience to climate change. It also noted that the risk-based approach was very helpful, and a range of parameters (variables) can be used to more fully assess vulnerability and risk.

34. The Chair noted the wide interest in this approach and suggested that, whilst it could already be seen as a useful tool for the management plans of the protected areas, with an increase in the number of parameters it would be even more useful. The Chair encouraged the United Kingdom, Norway and interested Members to continue the work.
35. SCAR briefly introduced IP 52 *Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment – 2011 Update*. SCAR pointed out that membership of the new SCAR ACCE Expert Group has been expanded to include a wider range of expertise and to include experts from Russia, China and other countries. It is SCAR's intention to continue to attract new members to ensure as broad a representation as possible. Over the short to medium term SCAR is also planning to put together a series of targeted publications building on the ACCE Report.
36. ASOC presented IP 83 *An Antarctic Climate Change Communication Plan* and IP 88 *Ocean Acidification and the Southern Ocean*.
37. The United Kingdom thanked ASOC for both information papers, and noted that regardless of whether this information was disseminated by the CEP or ATCM as a whole, or by individual Parties, it was important to raise awareness of the issues. The Committee agreed to encourage Parties to develop research in this field.
38. SCAR informed the Committee that an Action Group on Ocean Acidification would produce a comprehensive report in two years, focussing on both ecosystem and species responses to ocean acidification.
39. Other papers presented under this agenda item were:
 - IP 8 *COMNAP Energy Management Workshop* (COMNAP)
 - IP 56 *Marine Spatial Protection and Management under the Antarctic Treaty System: New Opportunities for Implementation and Coordination* (IUCN)
 - IP 65 *Frontiers in understanding Climate Change and Polar Ecosystems Workshop Report* (United States)

Item 6 Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)

6a) Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation

40. The United Kingdom presented WP 16 *Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) for the Proposed Exploration of Subglacial Lake Ellsworth, Antarctica* on behalf of the Lake Ellsworth Consortium. The United Kingdom expressed its gratitude to Norway for convening the ICG, and to all ICG participants for their constructive comments on the draft CEE, noting that a preliminary response to their comments is set out in IP 13 *The Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) for the Proposed Exploration of Subglacial Lake Ellsworth, Antarctica*.
41. Norway presented WP 14 *Report of the Intersessional Open-ended Contact Group to Consider the Draft CEE for the “Proposed Exploration of Subglacial Lake Ellsworth, Antarctica”*.
42. Norway remarked that, having reviewed United Kingdom's draft CEE for the “Proposed Exploration of Subglacial Lake Ellsworth, Antarctica” in accordance with the *Procedures for intersessional CEP consideration of draft CEEs*, the ICG advised the CEP that:
 - 1) The draft CEE and the process followed by United Kingdom generally conformed to the requirements of Article 3 of Annex I to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty.

- 2) There was general agreement with the proponent's conclusion that it will entail less than minor or transitory impact taking into account the rigorous preventative and mitigation measures proposed and adopted by the proponent. These have substantially mitigated the risks which justified preparing the CEE. There was, furthermore, general agreement that the proposed activity is justified on the basis of its global scientific importance and value to be gained by the exploration of Lake Ellsworth.
 - 3) The draft CEE is clear and well-structured
 - 4) When preparing the required final CEE, the proponent should closely consider and address, as appropriate, the comments raised by participants in Appendix A of WP 14.
 - 5) The final CEE could furthermore be improved by taking into consideration participants' editorial suggestions (identified in Appendix B of WP14)
43. Several Members underscored the importance of the CEE, and thanked Norway for leading the ICG. France noted that during this intersessional work, a number of participants had commented that the CEE lacked details on logistics aspects of the proposal.
 44. Germany thanked the United Kingdom for IP 13. Germany wanted to highlight the purpose of utilizing low impact drilling techniques that limit environmental impacts, and looks forward to the final CEE.
 45. The Netherlands raised a point of clarification with respect to the next step after consultation on the draft CEE. The Netherlands asked whether the United Kingdom was required to take into consideration the issues raised by the ICG and the Committee, before presenting the final CEE to the ATCM for approval.
 46. The Chair clarified that Annex I to the Protocol requires the proponent to address comments on a draft CEE received from other Parties. Accordingly, the CEP will offer technical advice to the ATCM on the adequacy of this CEE, as per the requirements under the Environmental Protocol.
 47. The Russian Federation agreed with the Chair's comments, and suggested that the United Kingdom should take on board the advice of the CEP on the draft CEE in accordance with established national procedures. Russia asserted that the United Kingdom needs to mitigate all potential problems, and provide explanations for why it has chosen the methodology it will employ.
 48. ASOC mentioned reference to its comments during the ICG on this draft CEE, and added that the impact to the environment and adequate compliance with the Environmental Protocol might be better addressed if the United Kingdom was to consider conducting an independent audit project of the drilling project like New Zealand undertook for the ANDrill CEE. It suggested that after entry a pristine subglacial lake could be considered to have been permanently altered and was no longer pristine.
 49. The United Kingdom expressed gratitude for the comments from many Members, and indicated that it would make every effort to respond to these comments when preparing the final CEE next year. The United Kingdom also thanked Norway as chair of the ICG.

CEP advice to the ATCM:

50. **The Committee discussed in detail the draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) prepared by the United Kingdom for the "Proposed Exploration of Subglacial Lake Ellsworth, Antarctica" (WP 16 and IP 13). It also discussed the report by Norway of the ICG established to consider the draft CEE in accordance with the Procedures for**

intersessional CEP consideration of Draft CEEs (WP 14), and additional information provided by the United Kingdom in response to issues raised in the ICG (IP 13). Those discussions are summarised in paragraphs 40-50 above.

51. Having fully considered the draft CEE, the Committee advises ATCM XXXIV that:

- 1) The draft CEE and the process followed by United Kingdom generally conform to the requirements of Article 3 of Annex I to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty.**
- 2) The information contained in the draft CEE supports its conclusions that the proposed activity will have no more than a minor or transitory impact on the Antarctic environment, taking into account the rigorous preventative and mitigation measures prepared and adopted by the proponent. Furthermore, the proposed activity is justified on the basis of the global scientific importance and value to be gained by the exploration of Lake Ellsworth.**

When preparing the required final CEE, the proponent should consider, and address as appropriate, all comments raised by Members. In particular, the ATCM's attention is drawn to the suggestions that the final CEE should provide further detail regarding: assessment of the activities of the support contractor, further documentation/consideration as to the issue of potential mixing at break-through, further discussion as to how to minimize the disturbance of the water column as a result of the presence of the scientific equipment, assessment of risk of equipment loss in the lake, consideration of the size of the on-ice team in light of project safety and considerations relating to international collaboration.

- 3) The draft CEE is clear and well-structured, well written and with high quality graphs and figures**

52. The CEP recommends that the ATCM endorse these views.

53. The Republic of Korea introduced WP 42 *The Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation for the construction and operation of the Jang Bogo Antarctic Research Station, Terra Nova Bay, Antarctica* and IP 19 containing the full Draft CEE. Highlighting the main scientific objectives of the project, which include the study of climate change issues and long term studies of the ocean and different ecosystems, Korea noted that the draft CEE was intended to show clearly how the impact on the Antarctic environment would be minimized, and to share the benefits of construction and research with the wider international community, by promoting international global scientific cooperation.
54. The Republic of Korea was grateful for the valuable work of the ICG in reviewing the draft CEE. The Republic of Korea thanked Norway for its suggestion to source an alternative solution to waste incineration, which will save a projected 50 tons of fuel annually.
55. Australia introduced WP 7, *Report of the intersessional open-ended contact group to consider the draft CEE for the "Construction and Operation of the Jang Bogo Station, Terra Nova Bay, Antarctica"*. It noted that the ICG had expressed strong support for the proponent's plans to minimize and mitigate the environmental impacts of the project, and had recognized that environmental considerations had clearly been a key consideration in the project planning. Australia briefly introduced the outcomes of the ICG, highlighting the opportunities that participants had identified to enhance the final CEE, in keeping with the objectives of the CEE process established under Annex I of the Protocol.

56. Many Members supported the Republic of Korea's plans, highlighting the importance of future international collaborations that this project will bring for research in East Antarctica. Some Members also noted with approval the use of alternative energy sources in the operation of the station.
57. China supported and congratulated the Republic of Korea's plan of constructing a new research station in Antarctica and believed it would serve the purpose of Antarctic Treaty. China agreed with the ICG's conclusion regarding to the draft CEE for Jang Bogo station and expected the final CEE would have good considerations of the comments from other parties.
58. The proposed station will lie only 10 km from the Italian Mario Zucchelli Station and will be close to the German Gondwana Station. France and Germany reported that Korea had visited their Antarctic research centres after completing the draft CEE to discuss many of the technical comments. Italy had proposed potential collaboration with Korea for the establishment of a marine protected area in Terra Nova Bay. The United States commended Korea for addressing questions and concerns raised in WP 7, through the timely submission of IP 76 and through additional information contained in its presentation to the CEP. The US offered to share pier building experiences at McMurdo Station with Korea.
59. Belgium pointed to the necessary collaboration between the new Korean station and the existing stations in the surroundings so as to reduce the cumulative impact on the environment. It showed interest in collaborating with Korea on undertaking long-term monitoring of the terrestrial and marine ecosystems in the region, including in the Amundsen Sea where few studies have yet been conducted; it indicated that the fact that the station will be constructed on the border of the Ross Sea will put Korea under a special responsibility should the Ross Sea or part of it get a protection status.
60. ASOC noted that since the station will operate year-round, its environmental impacts will be substantive. However, ASOC expressed appreciation for the decisions taken by Korea to minimise environmental impacts since the first draft was circulated, such as by eliminating incineration and by using precast concrete foundations. ASOC expressed hopes that now that Korea will be active in that part of Antarctica it will collaborate with Italy on the establishment of marine protection in the Ross Sea.
61. Korea expressed its appreciation for the Committee's support of its draft CEE.

CEP advice to the ATCM:

62. **The Committee discussed in detail the draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) prepared by the Republic of Korea for "Construction and Operation of the Jang Bogo Station, Terra Nova Bay, Antarctica" (WP 42 and IP 19). It also discussed the report by Australia of the ICG established to consider the draft CEE in accordance with the *Procedures for intersessional CEP consideration of Draft CEEs* (WP 7), and additional information provided by the Republic of Korea in response to issues raised in the ICG (IP 76). Those discussions are summarised in paragraphs 56 and 57 above.**
63. **Having fully considered the draft CEE, the Committee advises ATCM XXXIV that:**
1. **The draft CEE generally conforms to the requirements of Article 3 of Annex I to the Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty.**
 2. **The information contained in the draft CEE supports the proponent's conclusion that the construction and operation of Jang Bogo station is likely to have more than a minor or transitory impact on the environment. The information provided also supports the proponent's conclusion that these**

impacts will be outweighed by knowledge and information to be gained through the research activities that will be supported by the station.

- 3. When preparing the required final CEE, the proponent should consider, and address as appropriate, the comments raised by Members. In particular, the ATCM's attention is drawn to the suggestions that the final CEE should provide further detail regarding: the possible cumulative impacts of activities by multiple operators in the Terra Nova Bay region; the ancillary station infrastructure; the wastewater treatment system; the management of sewage and food wastes; oil spill prevention; measures to prevent impacts on the skua colony; measures to prevent the introduction of non-native species; and plans for decommissioning the station.**
- 4. The draft CEE is clear, well structured, and well presented.**

64. The CEP recommends that the ATCM endorses this view.

6b) Other EIA matters

65. The Russian Federation introduced WP54 *Technology for Investigating Water Strata of Subglacial Lake Vostok*.
66. China thanked Russia and encouraged the continued exchange of information on the use of technology in Antarctica. The United States thanked Russia for keeping the CEP updated on the progress and changes to the project.
67. Belgium asked about the precautionary measures in place if there is some technological failure, for example if the drill unit becomes stuck or the lake is contaminated. Russia responded that all questions on risks will be considered in the environmental impact assessment for the study.
68. New Zealand updated the Committee on the progress with the CEP Tourism Study, recalling the ATCM's interest in the CEP's proposal to examine the environmental aspects and impacts of tourism and non-governmental activities in Antarctica. Good progress has been made on the study, but it was not able to be completed in time for the meeting. New Zealand informed the Committee that the draft report had been uploaded to the CEP forum, and that it intended to complete the work in the coming year, with the support of the Management Group.
69. The Committee thanked New Zealand for the update and encouraged New Zealand to continue to pursue this work which has been identified as a priority by the CEP, and encouraged Members to participate in the Management Group.
70. ASOC presented IP 84 *Antarctic Tourism – What Next? Key Issues to Address with Binding Rules*; and IP 87 *Land-Based Tourism in Antarctica*.
71. Chile noted a correction to IP 87, informing the Committee that Chile did not promote commercial tourism in the Antarctic Peninsula, nor operate a hotel facility in the region. Chile does however offer refuge for people from other national programs who are in transit to other areas of the Antarctic Peninsula. Chile added it would be keen to respond to ASOC's questionnaire if asked, to provide information on its land-based infrastructure in Antarctica.
72. With reference to the ALE Camp at Union Glacier, the United States objected to ASOC's assumption that the field camp would have more than a minor or transitory impact on the surrounding environment. The United States suggested that ASOC should not draw such generalised conclusions, as understanding the full extent of the impact would require a review

- of the environmental impact assessment that includes the details regarding the proposed activity as well as mitigation measures that will be implemented.
73. Uruguay informed the Committee that it has not participated in any land-based tourism activities since 2008, and would also like to fill out the ASOC questionnaire.
 74. The United Kingdom informed the Committee that the two UK-based companies mentioned in the paper go through a very stringent permit process to make sure they fully comply with the Environmental Protocol.
 75. ASOC responded to Chile by noting that the reference to Chile's alleged support of commercial tourism in IP 87 was from information supplied by another Party when responding to the ASOC questionnaire, and not ASOC's own assessment.
 76. ASOC responded to the US that conclusions in the report have been based on as much accurate information as possible, but added that the content of IEE itself is not available on the ATS EIA database.
 77. India introduced IP 64 *Final Comprehensive Environmental Evaluation (CEE) of New Indian Research Station at Larsemann Hills, Antarctica and Update on Construction Activity*.
 78. The Russian Federation expressed support for this project.
 79. Belgium offered to collaborate on the efforts to evaluate the impact of the station on the area lakes, as it had been studying the biodiversity of those lakes near to the new station.
 80. Other papers submitted under this Agenda item were:
 - SP 5 rev 1 *Annual list of Initial Environmental Evaluations (IEE) and Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations (CEE) prepared between April 1st 2010 and March 31st 2011* was also presented under this Agenda item.
 - IP 72 *Methodology for Clean Access to the Subglacial Environment Associated with the Whillans Ice* (United States)
 - IP 123 *Estudio de Impacto Ambiental Ex-post de la Estacion Cientifica Ecuatoriana "Pedro Vicente Maldonado". Isla Greenwich-Shetland de Sur-Antartida, 2011-2012* (Ecuador)

Item 7 Area Protection and Management Plans

7a) Management Plans

i) Draft Management Plans which have been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans

81. In its capacity as convenor of the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans (SGMP), Australia introduced WP 47 *Subsidiary Group on Management Plans – Report on Terms of Reference #1 to #3: Review of Draft Management Plans*. The SGMP had reviewed the plan for ASPA 126 and recommended that the proponents make some structural amendments to the management plan and improvements to the maps, and had sought clarification on a number of other matters. The SGMP considered that the revised plan adequately addressed these comments, and it recommended that the CEP approve the revised management plan prepared by the United Kingdom, Chile and Spain for ASPA 126.
82. The Committee endorsed the SGMP's recommendation and agreed to forward the revised management plan for ASPA 126 to the ATCM for adoption.

ii) Draft revised Management Plans which had not been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans

83. The Committee considered revised management plans for ten Antarctic Specially Protected Areas (ASPAs) and one Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) under this category:
- *WP 3 Review of the management plan for ASPA No. 120, Pointe-Géologie Archipelago, Terre Adélie (France)*
 - *WP 4 Management Plan for ASPA No. 166, Port-Martin, Terre Adélie. Proposal to extend the existing Management Plan (France)*
 - *WP 6 Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 149 Cape Shirreff and San Telmo Island, Livingston Island, South Shetland Islands (USA & Chile)*
 - *WP 9 Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 122 Arrival Heights, Hut Point Peninsula, Ross Island (USA)*
 - *WP 23 Revision of the Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 140 Parts of Deception Island, South Shetland Islands (UK)*
 - *WP 29 Revised management plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 167, Hawker Island, Princess Elizabeth Land (Australia)*
 - *WP 31 Revision of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 116: New College Valley, Caughley Beach, Cape Bird, Ross Island (NZ)*
 - *WP 33 Revision of Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 131: Canada Glacier, Lake Fryxell, Taylor Valley, Victoria Land (NZ)*
 - *WP 39 Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Managed Area No. 2 McMurdo Dry Valleys, Southern Victoria Land (USA & NZ)*
 - *WP 50 Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPAs) No. 165 Edmonson Point, Ross Sea (Italy)*
 - *WP 58 Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 127 "HASWELL ISLAND" (Haswell Island and Adjacent Emperor Penguin Rookery on Fast Ice) Revised Management Plan (Russia)*
84. With respect to WP 3 and WP 4, France informed the Committee that it had conducted a five-yearly review of the management plans for ASPA 120 and ASPA 166. In light of these reviews, France proposed that the revised management plan for ASPA 120 be approved with only minor changes and that the management plan for ASPA 166 be approved without modification for a period of five years. The Committee noted France's advice that the management plan for ASPA 166 had been reviewed and did not require revision.
85. With respect to WP 6, the USA informed the Committee that only minor changes had been made to the management plan for ASPA 149.
86. In response to an enquiry from ASOC, the USA and Chile provided further details on the educational and historical values of ASPA 149 including archaeological artefacts present within the Area.

87. With respect to WP 9, the USA explained that some major changes had been made to the management plan for ASPA 122 including several revisions of the boundaries, new values, amendments to some maps and access to the area. The USA remarked that, while changes to the text of the management plan were major, changes to the values being protected and implementation were only minor.
88. With respect to WP 23, the United Kingdom proposed major changes to the management plan for ASPA 140 and asked the Committee to send this management plan for intersessional review by the SGMP. The Committee supported this proposal and agreed to refer the draft revised management plan to the SGMP for intersessional review.
89. With respect to WP 29, Australia informed the Committee that only minor amendments to the management plan for ASPA 167 were required. It had modified the provisions for access to the Area to provide the opportunity for more frequent censuses of the southern giant petrel colony, conducted in an appropriate manner such as through the use of automated digital cameras. This would improve the chances of developing a more detailed understanding of population status and trends, consistent with Resolution 5 (2009).
90. With respect to WP 31 and WP 33, New Zealand informed the Committee that the revised management plans for ASPA 116 and ASPA 131 included only minor updates and editorial changes and more detailed biodiversity information.
91. With respect to WP 39, USA informed the Committee of several important modifications in the revised management plan for ASMA 2 following a review process over three years. Changes were made to the boundaries of the Area, new values to be protected were identified, updated maps and photographs were produced, and the appendices were reorganised and updated. In addition, Scientific Zones and Restricted Zones had also been introduced to replace the former category of ‘Special Features’ and the former category of ‘Tourist Zone’ had been reclassified as Visitor Zone, the latter being considered more inclusive.
92. IAATO welcomed the intention of the proponents to consider additional visitor zones. Without undermining the importance of the area for scientific research, IAATO considers the current zoning be overly restrictive given that the ASMA area amounts to 17500 km² and that visitor zone is limited to an area of only 0.1 km² and noted the value to Antarctic science and conservation of safe and environmentally responsible high quality visitor experiences.
93. Italy introduced WP50, *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASP) No. 165 Edmonson Point, Ross Sea*. No substantial changes had been made to the existing management plan.
94. The Russian Federation introduced WP 58, *Revised Management Plan for Antarctic Specially Protected Area No. 127 “Haswell Island” (Haswell Island and Adjacent Emperor Penguin Rookery on Fast Ice)*. Minor changes had been made to the existing plan, including new information from research conducted in the last five years on subsection 6(i), and an update of the bibliography in section 8.
95. The Committee approved all the revised Management Plans other than ASPA 140, which it forwarded to the SGMP for intersessional review.

Advice to the ATCM

96. **In reviewing the advice of the SGMP and following the Committee’s assessment the Committee agreed to forward the following management plans to the ATCM for adoption:**

#	Name
ASMA 2	<i>Antarctic Specially Managed Area No. 2 McMurdo Dry Valleys, Southern Victoria Land</i>
ASPA 116	<i>New College Valley, Caughley Beach, Cape Bird, Ross Island</i>
ASPA 120	<i>Pointe-Géologie Archipelago, Terre Adélie</i>
ASPA 126	<i>Byers Peninsula, Livingstone Island, South Shetland Islands</i>
ASPA 122	<i>Arrival Heights, Hut Point Peninsula, Ross Island</i>
ASPA 127	<i>“HASWELL ISLAND” (Haswell Island and Adjacent Emperor Penguin Rooker Fast Ice) Revised Management Plan</i>
ASPA 131	<i>Canada Glacier, Lake Fryxell, Taylor Valley, Victoria Land</i>
ASPA 149	<i>Cape Shirreff and San Telmo Island, Livingston Island, South Shetland Islands</i>
ASPA 165	<i>Edmonson Point, Ross Sea</i>
ASPA 167	<i>Hawker Island, Princess Elizabeth Land</i>

97. The United States introduced WP 10 *Developing a plan for Special protection at Taylor Glacier and Blood Falls, Taylor Valley, McMurdo Dry Valleys, Victoria Land*. The USA proposed the establishment of an informal International Working Group to discuss area protection at Taylor Glacier and Blood Falls and to develop a draft ASPA Management Plan to be submitted to the CEP in 2012. The United States offered to coordinate this group and Norway and SCAR noted their interest in contributing to the discussions. Norway also noted the usefulness of having such an open process in developing new ASPAs.
98. Australia introduced WP 13 *Subsidiary Group on Management Plans – Report on Terms of Reference #4 and #5: Improving Management Plans and the Process for their Intersessional Review* on behalf of the SGMP. The SGMP invited the CEP to consider the outcomes of its intersessional work, which had been conducted in accordance with the work plan adopted by CEP XIII.
99. During the intersessional period, the SGMP had reviewed and revised the *Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas* (adopted under Resolution 2 (1988)), including to incorporate standard wording and a template for ASPA management plans. The modifications introduced had, among other things, addressed a range of matters referred to the SGMP by CEP XIII for consideration. The SGMP had also consulted with relevant Members to review the status of management plans that were overdue for five-yearly review.
100. The United States stressed that the SGMP should be seen as an important resource for those Members needing help in writing or reviewing management plans. Australia urged other Members to participate in SGMP to enhance its expertise and value.
101. Argentina and Chile noted that this management plan template should not be prescriptive, and should allow Members to be innovative when preparing Management Plans for ASPAs.

102. Australia reiterated that the suggested standard wording and template for ASPA management plans, and the revised Guide, prepared by the SGMP were intended as tools to assist consistency between management plans. They were not intended to be prescriptive or to discourage proponents from developing and implementing site-specific or creative and innovative approaches to area protection and management.
103. The Committee thanked the SGMP for its work and agreed to:
- endorse the revised *Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas* and incorporated template and standard wording for ASPA management plans presented at Attachment A to WP 13 and
 - encourage proponent Parties of management plans that have not yet provided information on the status of ASPA management plans overdue for review to provide such information.
104. The Meeting also adopted a work plan for the SGMP's activities during the 2011/12 intersessional period as identified in Attachment C of WP 13 (see Appendix 1).

CEP Advice to the ATCM

105. The Committee recommends that the ATCM adopt a Resolution approving the new *Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas*.

106. The United Kingdom presented WP 18 *Proposed Monitoring Activities Within Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) No.107 Emperor Island, Dion Islands, Marguerite Bay, Antarctic Peninsula*. The United Kingdom noted that the continued existence of the emperor penguin colony within this ASPA is in doubt, and that further research is necessary to assess its status. The occurrence of this colony represents the sole value worthy of protection within this ASPA and led to its designation.
107. The United States and Australia commented that further monitoring of the Dion Islands ASPA seems a sensible way to move forward. Australia noted that, as a general rule, well documented areas such as ASPAs which are highly vulnerable to climate change may be of value to science for observing and tracking the impacts of climate change, and the possible existence of such new or emerging values should be closely considered when determining the benefits of continued designation of an Area.
108. The Committee supported the approach planned by the United Kingdom and looked forward to receiving further information on the status of the values at ASPA 107.
109. The Secretariat presented SP 7 *Status of Antarctic Specially Protected Area and Antarctic Specially Managed Area Management Plans*. The CEP was asked if this register was still required, since this information is now available from the online ASPA/ASMA Database on the Secretariat website.
110. Chile and Germany moved for keeping and improving this register. Germany inquired what happens when the review date has been passed without any review of the management plans.
111. The Chair thanked Germany and noted that this point was brought up by the ICG. The Chair emphasised the necessity of the Secretariat reminding Members of the status of the ASPA/ASMA management plans and their responsibilities for initiating subsequent reviews.
112. Norway noted that the review process does not necessarily need to result in the tabling of a revision of the ASPA/ASMA management plans. Germany asked if the "next revision" column could be used more proactively.

113. Australia suggested that the Secretariat could send a reminder to those Parties responsible for an ASPA/ASMA management plan that is due for a review during the next year, and in doing so could draw attention to the revised *Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas* (WP 13) to help facilitate the review.
114. The United Kingdom commented that it has initiated or completed field work for the review process of six ASPAs, which will put the United Kingdom in a good position to be fully up to date with the upcoming review process of the corresponding management plans.
115. Chile noted that its reviews of three outstanding ASPA management plans would be ready for presentation next year.
116. IP 79 (Australia, China, India, Romania, Russian Federation): *Report of the Larsemann Hills Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) Management Group* was also presented under this Agenda item.
117. The United States presented IP 73 *Amundsen-Scott South Pole Station, South Pole Antarctica Specially Managed Area (ASMA No. 5) 2011 Management Report*, and noted that more visitors each year present a challenge for combining tourist activities with research activities. IP 73 was not presented as a Working Paper because the USA needed to determine if the changes made so far would work (for example the moving of the tourist camping site away from the main research station). The United States mentioned that it has an excellent collaboration with IAATO.
118. The United Kingdom suggested that the process of developing the ASMA guidelines could have started earlier and that the lack of a formal process or changes to the management plan could create problems in advising visitors of the new rules or guidelines. The USA noted that it expected to revise the guidelines in the coming year, and would appreciate assistance from any interested Members. It intended to present a more formal set of guidelines next year.
119. India introduced IP 79 *Report of the Larsemann Hills Antarctic Specially Managed Area (ASMA) Management Group* on behalf of ASMA 6 Management Group (Australia, China, India, Romania, Russian Federation) highlighting the need for the establishment of an ASPA on this region. Belgium and Romania supported the proposal and offered collaboration.
120. Regarding IP 131 *Deception Island Specially Managed Area (ASMA) Management Group Report* (Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, United Kingdom, United States), Spain informed the Meeting that they will present a new management plan revision next year for ASMA no.4.
121. Korea introduced IP 115 *Survey of the ASPA 171 Narebski Point, ASPA 150 Ardley Island and ASPA 132 Potter Peninsula in 2010-11* and also introduced IP 109 *Cooperation Management Activities at ASPAs in King George Island (Isla 25 de Mayo), South Shetland Islands*, submitted jointly with Argentina. Both are related to Korean efforts to improve the environmental management plan for ASPA 171.

7 b): Historic Sites and Monuments

122. Argentina noted that during the 13th CEP meeting Argentina offered to coordinate an informal debate during the intersessional period on Historical Sites and Monuments. Argentina thanked several Members for their significant contributions during the debate, the results of which are summarized in WP 27 *Report of the Informal Discussions on Historic Sites and Monuments*.
123. During these debates, work focused on two main lines: a) the different ways Parties define and apply the concept of "historic heritage" and on the existing agreed definitions on the Antarctic context, and b) the adequacy of the existing mechanisms available in the Antarctic Treaty system for the protection of historic sites. Concerning the former, the informal discussion group had concluded that a wide range of definitions existed on what can be considered a HSM, while in reference to the latter, some participants considered that the existing criteria are

- broad enough to accommodate different views on heritage, while others saw this flexibility as a limitation to define the historic character of a site.
124. Given the broad variety of concepts and views on these issues, the group concluded that it would be beneficial to continue discussing these matters on the CEP forum.
 125. While thanking Argentina for its work, China noted that caution was necessary as in the diversity of cultures that exist in the Antarctic community any rigid definition might not prove helpful. China announced that it would like to participate in further discussions.
 126. Several Members expressed their appreciation for Argentina's work and encouraged further debates on this issue. Norway noted that there are a number of relevant issues to discuss further to achieve a common understanding of how to classify historical sites and monuments. The United States expressed the need to make listings more transparent and accessible to a wider audience. The United Kingdom pointed out that a rigid definition of 'historical monuments' was unlikely to be possible and probably not necessary given the diversity of the Antarctic community.
 127. The Committee agreed that the informal discussions on Historic Sites and Monuments had been useful and should continue.
 128. Argentina concluded that the main objective of these debates was not to reach agreement on specific definitions, but to exchange different points of view on an issue that is complex, especially because it deals with social sciences where cultural differences may lead to diverse interpretations on historic heritage. Argentina expressed its gratitude for the Committee's confidence in the work of this group.
 129. China presented WP 5 *Proposed addition of No.1 Building Commemorating China's Antarctic Expedition at Great Wall Station to the List of Historic Sites and Monument*, highlighting the value of Building No. 1 and suggesting that its inclusion on the list would be a positive enhancement.
 130. Japan drew attention to the size of Building No.1 and expressed concerns over its potential impact on the surrounding environment, but wished to support the designation of this important building.
 131. The United Kingdom drew attention to comments in its 2005 Inspection Report which highlighted the need for repair work to prevent further deterioration and asked if this had been carried out. Several Members, while showing their support for the proposal, requested more information on the maintenance and conservation of the building.
 132. China thanked the Members for their support and assured the Committee that the maintenance and conservation plan was in progress, and that further details of this would be provided in the future.
 133. The Committee approved the proposals presented in WP 5 and passed them to be considered by the ATCM.
 134. Chile presented WP 59 *Proposal of Modification for the Historic Monument No. 82 Installation of Commemorative Plaques at the Monument to the Antarctic Treaty*. Chile informed the Committee that, in accordance with Measure 3 (2007), four plaques in commemoration of the International Polar Year had been installed in each of the official languages of the Antarctic Treaty System at the "Monument to the Antarctic Treaty" near Frei, Bellingshausen and Escudero stations at King George Island. The proposed modification relates to a minor change in wording of the HSM No. 82.
 135. The Committee approved Chile's request and its submission to the ATCM.

Advice to the ATCM

136. **The Committee recommends that the ATCM approve the addition of the following new site to the list of Historic Sites and Monuments in Measure 3 (2003):**
- **No.1 Building Commemorating China’s Antarctic Expedition at Great Wall Station**
137. **The Committee also recommends that the ATCM approve the proposed modification of the HSM No. 82 Monument to the Antarctic Treaty.**
138. The Secretariat noted that the latest list of Historic Sites and Monuments was very outdated and suggested that the ATCM task the Secretariat with updating the list annually. The United Kingdom and France expressed their support for the Secretariat’s proposal and the Committee agreed to ask the ATCM to decide whether the Secretariat should be tasked with updating the Historic Sites and Monuments list.

Advice to the ATCM

139. **The Committee recommends that the ATCM ask the Secretariat to keep the official lists of ASPAs, ASMAs and HSMs updated according to Measures taken at the ATCM.**
-
140. Argentina referred to IP 130 *Update on enhancement activities for HSM 38 “Snow Hill”*, noting that this paper provides continuity to the series of papers presented by Argentina to the CEP over years on the management and conservation activities at HSM 38.
141. Also submitted under this agenda items was:
- IP 117 (Chile): *Inauguración de la instalación de Placas Conmemorativas en el Monumento al Tratado Antártico.*

7c) Site Guidelines

142. In its capacity as convener, Australia presented *WP45 Report of the open-ended intersessional contact group on revision of environmental elements of Recommendation XVIII-1*. Australia informed the Committee that the ICG had developed updated guidelines for visitors based on Recommendation XVIII-1 (1994), but in a format suitable for use as a generic cover to accompany site specific guidelines.
143. Australia reported that several issues were left unresolved in the ICG’s discussions, such as the inclusion of specific minimum distances for approaches to wildlife.
144. The ICG recommended that the CEP:
1. endorse the attached guidelines, and forward them to the ATCM for adoption by means of a Resolution;
 2. agree that an ICG be convened to consider new site guidelines requiring detailed discussion;
 3. decide that, in general, site guidelines should be periodically reviewed at least every five years;
 4. request the Secretariat to develop a review schedule for site guidelines based on a five-yearly review period, for consideration by CEP XV; and
 5. encourage Members bringing forward new site guidelines to give consideration to the generic guidelines, and to focus on matters specific to the circumstances of each site.

145. New Zealand and Chile expressed their support for the guidelines and the ICG's recommendations. Ecuador expressed an interest in participating in future work of the ICG given its experience of managing visitors to the Galapagos Islands.
146. Several Members showed in-principle support for the ICG's recommendations while raising some specific concerns. The USA was uncertain about the relationship between the updated guidelines and Recommendation XVIII-1 (1994) and believed that further discussion on this topic should be referred to the Legal and Institutional Working Group. Germany expressed a view that the guidelines should identify specific minimum approach distances from wildlife, hence advocating a precautionary approach.
147. In response to Germany, the Chair noted the advice from SCAR, presented in 2008 at ATCM XXXI WP12 *Human disturbance to wildlife in the broader Antarctic region: a review of findings*. Given the range of variables likely to have an influence on susceptibility to disturbance, SCAR had reported that it was difficult to identify specific wildlife approach distances.
148. The United Kingdom indicated its overall support for work to update the generic site guidelines while expressing concerns that the site guidelines, as drafted, were not ready for consideration by the ATCM. The United Kingdom emphasised that the provisions of Recommendation XVIII-1 (1994), which had not yet entered into force, would be mandatory while the guidelines developed by the ICG would remain voluntary. The United Kingdom strongly encouraged ratification of Recommendation XVIII-1 (1994) by all Parties so that it would come into force. The United Kingdom did not agree with the proposal for a formal mandatory and automatic review of specific site guidelines by the original proponents. Instead, site guidelines should be reviewed and revised as and when necessary and by any Party.
149. Having reminded the Committee that Recommendation XVIII-1 (1994) was divided into two parts, IAATO suggested that the guidelines developed by the ICG could be used to replace the second part of Recommendation XVIII-1 (1994). IAATO also encouraged the outstanding ratification to Recommendation XVIII-1 (1994) to be made as soon as possible.
150. The CEP considered WP 45 and agreed that the provision of general environmental advice to visitors, based on the current understanding of the CEP, would complement the site specific guidelines. The CEP again noted the desirability of Recommendation XVIII-1 (1994) entering into force.
151. After comments raised by some members, Australia convened work in a contact group, and the CEP subsequently finalised *Guidelines for Visitors to the Antarctic*.
152. In considering the other recommendations of the ICG, the CEP decided that its present practice of considering new guidelines, and reviewing existing guidelines as they are brought forward would suffice.

CEP advice to the ATCM:

153. **The CEP finalised environmental advice to visitors in the form of Guidelines for visitors to the Antarctic, suitable for use as a cover sheet to accompany site specific guidelines. The CEP recommended that the ATCM adopt them by means of a Resolution, and that the Secretariat make them available alongside the site specific guidelines.**
154. **The CEP also encouraged Members, in bringing forward new site guidelines to give consideration to the generic guidelines, and focus on matters specific to the circumstances of each site.**
-

155. United Kingdom introduced *WP 17 Revision of Site Guidelines for Whalers Bay, Deception Island, South Shetland Islands* on behalf of the ASMA Management Group for Deception Island. The paper proposed minor changes to the existing site guidelines including the correction of minor typographical errors, clarification of landing site location and revision of maps.
156. New Zealand introduced *WP 30 Site Guidelines for the Taylor Valley Visitor Zone, Southern Victoria Land*, jointly prepared with USA.
157. As part of the review of the McMurdo Dry Valleys ASMA, the Management Group agreed to re-format the existing tourism provisions in that Plan into site guidelines format. The guidelines reflect the existing management provisions. New Zealand noted that there had been a minor change to a boundary of the zone following concerns raised by scientists about the sensitivity of the site.
158. The United Kingdom thanked New Zealand and the United States for their work and asked about monitoring at the site and about the size of the area relative to the visitation rate..
159. New Zealand noted that the site was the subject of long term monitoring of visitor impacts through its VISTA monitoring programme as well as other scientific research in the area, and that the site was only accessible by helicopter, limiting the number of visitors at the site at any one time.
160. IAATO expressed concern over the revision of the boundary, and welcomed the opportunity to discuss other possible visitor zones in the Dry Valleys ASMA in the future.
161. ASOC noted the need for environmental impact assessment for the establishment of any proposed new visitor zones.
162. Chile presented *WP 49 Guidelines for the north-east beach of the Ardley Peninsula (Ardley Island), King George Island (Isla 25 de Mayo), South Shetland Islands*, jointly elaborated with Argentina.
163. Several Members expressed their support for the proposal while some Members sought further clarification on the guidelines. China suggested that the guidelines include a precise definition of the term “Visitor”. In response to China’s enquiry, Chile clarified that “Visitor” is understood as any person who lands on the beach and is not required to conduct any scientific work there.
164. Australia introduced *WP52 Rev1 Visitor site guide for Mawson’s Huts and Cape Denison, East Antarctica*. Australia noted that Cape Denison is one of six sites remaining from the ‘heroic era’ of Antarctic exploration, and is designated as Historic Site and Monument No. 77, and ASMA 3. Within the ASMA, the four timber huts of the Australasian Antarctic Expedition and immediate surrounds are designated as ASPA 162. The values of the site are significant, and the site is sensitive to the potential impacts associated with visits. Australia therefore regards a visitor site guide as a useful adjunct to the existing management arrangements. The proposed visitor site guide does not replace or extend the provisions of the ASPA and ASMA management plans.
165. IAATO welcomed the proposed new site guidelines.
166. IAATO presented IP 104 *Proposed Amendment to Antarctic Treaty Site Guidelines for Hannah Point* informing the Meeting that, following an incident in which an elephant seal, possibly disturbed by visitors, went over a cliff, IAATO had internally adopted a precautionary extension to closed Area B in the Site Guidelines for Hannah Point, should elephant seals be hauled out in the area at the time of a visit. IAATO informed that immediately following the incident, it circulated a message to all IAATO vessels still operating in the area to alert them to the incident and ask them to keep away from the cliff edge area if elephant seals were present. The incident was discussed at the IAATO Meeting in

2011, where the members agreed to an additional precautionary measure to the application of the Site Guidelines for Hannah Point. IAATO suggested the Committee consider and adopt this amendment. After a broad discussion the Committee agreed to amend the Site Guidelines for Hannah Point in line with IAATO's suggestion.

167. The Committee approved the revised versions of the site guidelines for Whalers Bay and Hannah Point and the new site guidelines for Taylor Valley, Ardley Peninsula and Mawson's Hut.

Advice to the ATCM

- 168. The Committee approved the revised guidelines for Whalers Bay, and Hannah Point and the new site guidelines for Taylor Valley, Ardley Peninsula, and Mawson's Hut, and agreed to forward them to the ATCM for adoption by means of a Resolution.**
-

169. Ukraine briefly introduced IP 110 *Ukraine policy regarding visits by tourists to Vernadsky Station* and invited interested Members to submit comments in the course of the work.
170. The USA introduced IP 23 *Antarctic Peninsula Compendium, 3rd Edition (USA & UK)* and announced the availability of the third edition of the Antarctic Peninsula Compendium, which compiles data and site descriptive information from the 142 locations the Antarctic Site Inventory has visited and censused in 17 field seasons from November 1994-February 2011. The Compendium is available on disc and at the Oceanites website (<http://www.oceanites.org>).
171. Bulgaria briefly introduced IP 12 *Guidelines of environmental behavior of the expedition participants and visitors to the Bulgarian Base in Antarctica* and hoped that these guidelines would prove useful for other stations in Antarctica.
172. Other papers *submitted* under this agenda item included:
- IP 9 (USA): *Antarctic Site Inventory: 1994-2011*
 - IP 105 (IAATO): *Report on IAATO Operator use of Antarctic Peninsula Landing Sites and ATCM Visitor Site Guidelines, 2009-10 & 2010-11 Seasons*
 - IP 126 (Ecuador): *Manejo turístico para la isla Barrientos*

7d) Human footprint and wilderness values

173. New Zealand introduced WP 35 *Understanding concepts of Footprint and Wilderness related to protection of the Antarctic environment*. New Zealand recommended that CEP XIV aim for agreement among the Members on practical definitions of footprint and wilderness in the Antarctic context. It suggested that the CEP should consider medium term goals for improving planning and environmental impact assessment to minimize footprint and give greater protection to inviolate areas and wilderness values through Annex V measures.
174. Australia highlighted that any definitions of footprint and wilderness should be able to be practically applied. For example, it recalled that most references to footprint in past CEP discussions had referred to the spatial extent of physical disturbance, which would be beneficial in environmental terms, including to prioritise action to minimise impacts on rare and environmentally sensitive ice-free areas. Australia expressed its willingness to continue informal discussions with New Zealand during the intersessional period.
175. The United Kingdom agreed in principle with the definition suggested, but noted wilderness did not automatically exclude science. It noted that the concept of planning for areas never

- visited as inviolate reference and wilderness areas has been called for, for over 40 years and should be advanced.
176. The USA and Belgium also supported the work agreeing that setting aside inviolate reference areas could be valuable.
177. Argentina mentioned that it would prefer a general approach rather than a specific definition of footprint and wilderness, as it is often used on a case by case basis. Argentina also noted that international cooperation encouraged the retention of wilderness values in Antarctica, by avoiding the duplication of efforts, leading to a more reduced footprint from such activities.
178. The Chair noted the interest of the Committee in the development of terminology and the support for the concept of inviolate areas.
179. ASOC introduced IP 86 *Evolution of Footprint: Spatial and Temporal Dimensions of Human Activities*. ASOC encouraged the CEP to seek consensus on the definitions for footprint and wilderness, and approve these definitions.
180. Other papers submitted under this Agenda item were:
- IP 1 (United States) *Temporal and spatial patterns of anthropogenic disturbance at McMurdo Station, Antarctica*.
 - IP 2 (United States) *The Historical Development of McMurdo Station, Antarctica, An Environment Perspective*.
 - IP 43 (Uruguay) *Discovery of human activity remains, pre-1958 in the north coast of the King George Island (Isla 25 de Mayo)*.
 - IP 133 (Czech Republic) *Report on all-terrain vehicles impact on deglaciated area of James Ross Island, Antarctica*.

7e) Marine spatial protection and management

181. The Secretariat introduced SP6 *Summary of the Work of the CEP on Marine Protected Areas*.
182. Several Members commended the excellent report, and noted that it would have been very useful had it been available at the time of the joint CEP/CCAMLR Workshop in 2009.
183. A number of Members referenced a CEP decision at the 2009 Baltimore ATCM/CEP Meeting, which committed the CEP to promote a harmonised approach for the protection of the Antarctic marine environment through the establishment of MPAs within, but not exclusively limited to, 11 priority areas by 2012.
184. The Committee request the Secretariat to provide regular updates of the report online at the ATS website, so Parties can be kept up to date with this issue.
185. The Secretariat confirmed that the request could be fulfilled.
186. The Committee noted that a number of scientists from Members will participate in the CCAMLR MPA Workshop to be held in Brest, France from August 29th to September 2nd 2011.
187. Belgium fully supported the creation of a representative network of MPAs. Belgium noted that it hosts and coordinates the SCAR-MARBIN database used by the Antarctic community.

188. The Committee recalled its previous agreement to engage constructively with CCAMLR on these matters and noted that it looks forward to a report on the upcoming CCAMLR MPA Workshop in Brest, France. The Committee thanked CCAMLR for its invitations to attend the Workshop. Polly Penhale from the United States will be the CEP Representative.
189. ASOC (on behalf of IUCN) introduced the IP 56 *Marine Spatial Protection and Management under the Antarctic Treaty System: New Opportunities for Implementation and Coordination*.
190. ASOC presented IP 90: *The Southern Ocean MPA Agenda – Matching Words and Spirit with Action*; and IP 92: *The Ross Sea: A Valuable Reference Area to Assess the Effects of Climate Change*.
191. Thanking the Secretariat for the MPA paper ASOC noted that at the 2009 joint CEP / SC-CAMLR workshop, both bodies agreed to cooperate in establishing a representative network of MPAs in the Southern Ocean. CCAMLR agreed on a work plan towards creation of the MPA network by the 2012 target date. This timetable is reflected in the CEP five-year work plan. The first milestone of the proposed work plan is for Members to collate relevant data for the 11 priority areas and others as appropriate and characterize each region in terms of biodiversity patterns and ecosystem processes, physical environmental features. However, there appears to have been little progress so far on this milestone. The second milestone is the special MPA workshop this coming August in Brest, France. ASOC urged ATCPs and CCAMLR Members to make effective use of this opportunity to address milestone one and present robust MPA proposals.
192. Turning to IP 92 ASOC noted that it had put forward a number of papers making the ‘science case’ for supporting full protection of the Ross Sea slope and shelf in the context of establishing an important component of a representative network of MPAs in the Southern Ocean. This particular paper focuses on the climate reference zone potential of the Ross Sea. Since the International Panel on Climate Change models predicts that the Ross Sea will be the last portion of the Southern Ocean with sea ice year round the Ross Sea will be a ‘refugium’ for the study of normal ice processes and associated biota, and can serve as an important reference area to help understand the magnitude and the ecological and economic significance of changes elsewhere in the Southern Ocean.

7f) Other Annex V matters

193. Australia introduced WP 32 *Enhancing the Antarctic Protected Areas Database* to help assess and further develop the protected areas system. Australia proposed that the CEP agree that the Antarctic Protected Areas Database should be expanded to include further relevant information (to be provided by proponents when submitting management plans), encourage proponents to make Area boundaries available in a digital format suitable for use in a geographic information system (GIS) where possible, and request the Secretariat to take the steps necessary to accommodate these changes.
194. The Committee supported the recommendations presented in WP 32 and agreed:
- that the Antarctic Protected Areas Database should be expanded to include fields representing: (1) primary reason for designation; and (2) main Environmental Domain represented;
 - to recommend that the ATCM modifies the coversheet for Working Papers presenting ASPAs and ASMAs appended to Resolution 1 (2008) to allow the Secretariat to capture the relevant information for inclusion in the database;
 - to encourage proponents to make ASPA and ASMA boundaries available in a digital format suitable for use in a GIS where possible, and to provide this information to the Secretariat for

central management and access via the Antarctic Protected Areas Database; and

- to request the Secretariat to modify the Antarctic Protected Areas Database as necessary to accommodate these changes.

195. Several Members noted that, due to technical and resource constraints, not all Members were in a position to implement all of these recommendations at this time.
196. In response to these concerns, Australia emphasised the voluntary nature of this aspect of the proposal. It encouraged those Members with the capacity to implement all recommendations to do so while offering assistance and support to those Members who lacked this capacity. Australia also reassured the Committee that issues of data compatibility and exchange could be addressed and that it would consult with the Secretariat to find practical solutions to these challenges.
197. Norway also noted that there may be issues relating to exchange format standards, etc, that need to be discussed further in the future.
198. Australia announced that it was in consultation with a private company that had prepared a comprehensive dataset of spatial information representing the boundaries of all existing ASPAs and ASMAs. Australia planned to purchase this dataset and convey it to the Secretariat with a view to making the data widely available. Australia will work with the Secretariat during the intersessional period to that end.
199. In order to allow the Secretariat to capture the relevant information for inclusion in the database, the Committee drafted modifications to the coversheet for Working Papers presenting ASPAs and ASMAs appended to Resolution 1 (2008) in the form of a Resolution.

CEP Advice for the ATCM

200. The Committee recommends that the ATCM adopt the Revised Guide to the Presentation of Working Papers containing proposals for ASPA/ASMA/HSM by means of a Resolution.

201. Germany introduced WP 41 *Fourth Progress Report on the Discussion of the International Working Group about Possibilities for Environmental Management of Fildes Peninsula and Ardley Island*.
202. The co-authors proposed a meeting of the IWG during the CEP XIV Buenos Aires for further discussion, and encouraged interested Members to continue to work and revise the document, and contribute information and feedback to the continued work of the IWG.
203. Uruguay encouraged the Parties who are active in the Fildes Peninsula to participate in the discussion with respect to the IWG to continue the protection of this region.
204. China agreed to continue participation, and informed the committee it had sent its comments to the IWG. China agreed to the present version of Annex 3 to WP 41.
205. The Chair noted that the CEP would continue to discuss the work of the IWG at the next CEP meeting in Hobart.
206. The Russian Federation introduced WP 57 *On the Need of Constant Monitoring of the Values of Antarctic Specially Protected Areas and Antarctic Specially Managed Areas*.
207. A number of Members supported this Working Paper, but several noted caution was required when asserting the monitoring should be made mandatory, as visiting a site for monitoring purposes might cause further harm to the values the ASPA/ASMA is trying to protect.

208. The Russian Federation responded that monitoring was intended to be mandatory, but would not necessarily require a site visit, as even remote monitoring is very important for reviewing management plans of ASPAs/ASMAs
209. France noted that in most management plans submitted this year the values for each site had been revised.
210. The Committee agreed to return to discussion of this topic at the next CEP meeting.
211. Australia presented WP 61 rev. 1 *Report of the CEP Workshop on Marine and Terrestrial Antarctic Specially Managed Areas. Montevideo, Uruguay, 16-17 June 2011.* Australia noted that CEP XIII had endorsed a proposal by the SGMP to convene an ASMA workshop to exchange good practice and work towards producing guidelines for preparing management plans for ASMAs.
212. The workshop co-conveners, Juan Abdala (Uruguay) and Ewan McIvor (Australia) thanked all participants for their involvement and expressed regret that several other colleagues had been unable to attend due to flight cancellations. WP 61 rev. 1 and IP 136 presented the recommendations arising and key points raised under the four terms of reference for the workshop, which were:
1. Share good practice by examining common issues arising and lessons learnt from different approaches to site management in Antarctica, and drawing upon relevant approaches to the management of multiple use areas elsewhere.
 2. Develop guidelines for the preparation of ASMA management plans.
 3. Identify the characteristics of potential new ASMAs.
 4. Prepare a report for CEP XIV.
213. The Committee congratulated the organisers of the Workshop and Uruguay for hosting the Workshop, and strongly emphasised the importance of continuing this work.
214. Uruguay informed the Committee that the most important aim of this workshop was to consolidate a system for creating management plans for marine and terrestrial ASMAs. Uruguay cautioned that facilitation of information exchange between operators and bureaucrats needed to be practical otherwise we risked unrealistic expectations in the application of the protection measures required of the region.
215. The Committee supported the four recommendations arising from the workshop, and agreed to:
1. Request the Secretariat to establish links from the ATS website to ASMA websites, where available.
 2. Promote further exchange of information on good practice in ASMA management. In particular, ASMA Management Groups could be encouraged to share information regarding initiatives that may be of broader interest for application in other ASMAs.
 3. Seek to identify opportunities to draw on COMNAP's broader experience and responsibilities to help facilitate cooperation and coordination in the development, implementation and management of ASMAs. In addition, the CEP agreed to seek to draw on SCAR with respect to scientific activities, IAATO with respect to tourism activities, and SC-CAMLR with respect to good practice in the identification, management and monitoring of marine areas.

4. Encourage interested Members to review the provisions of existing ASMA management plans, with a view to preparing a suggested work plan and supporting materials to support work by the SGMP to develop guidance for establishing ASMAs and for preparing and reviewing ASMA management plans.
216. COMNAP also congratulated the organisers and was pleased to have participated in the Workshop. It also noted it was pleased to see inclusion of Recommendation 3 of WP 61.
217. ASOC thanked Australia and Uruguay for organising and coordinating the ASMA workshop. ASOC noted that in its view the diversity of current ASMAs highlights the flexibility of the ASMA as an instrument for area protection, as well as the potential to expand its use beyond current applications in the establishment of new marine and terrestrial ASMAs.
218. The following IPs were also submitted under this agenda item:
- IP 24 (Germany) *Progress Report on the Research Project “Current Environmental Situation and Management Proposals for the Fildes Region (Antarctic)”*.
 - IP 69 (Australia): *Summary of Key Features of Antarctic Specially Managed Areas*.
 - IP 102 (Russian Federation): *Present Zoological Study at Mirny Station Area at ASPA No.127 “Haswell Island”*.
219. The Chair noted that IP 109 (*Republic of Korea and Argentina*): *Cooperation Management Activities at ASPAs in King George Island (Isla 25 de Mayo), South Shetland Islands*, had already been introduced earlier in the week under Agenda Item 7(a).

Item 8 Conservation of Antarctic Flora and Fauna

8a) Quarantine and Non-native Species

220. In its capacity as convenor, New Zealand introduced *WP 34 Report of the Intersessional Contact Group on Non-Native Species 2010-2011*. New Zealand summarised the major outcomes of the ICG’s second year of work, including completion of the overall objective and key guiding principles for Parties’ actions to address risks posed by non-native species and of the Non-Native Species Manual.
221. The Committee congratulated New Zealand and ICG participants for their work, noting the complexity of discussing issues related to non-native species. Many Members thanked the ICG for producing such comprehensive and practical outcomes.
222. Several Members agreed that the Manual should be posted on the ATS website and remain a living document to be updated from time to time as required.
223. Chile and Uruguay emphasised the need to have the Manual and related documents available in all four Treaty languages, to facilitate the use of the Manual.
224. In light of discussions on WP34, Germany drew the Committee’s attention to IP 26 *Progress Report on the 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 informed the Committee that it would bring the results of this research project to the attention of the next CEP.
225. In response to a suggestion from India, COMNAP agreed to facilitate the dissemination of the Manual to managers of National Antarctic Programmes.

226. IAATO informed the Committee that it would include a link to the Manual in the IAATO Field Operations Manual.
227. Netherlands encouraged examples and case studies to be included on the ATS website alongside the Manual.
228. Following discussion of WP 34, the Committee agreed to support the ICG's recommendations to:
- 1) Endorse the overall objective and key guiding principles for Parties' actions to address risks posed by non-native species;
 - 2) Encourage the dissemination and use of the Manual;
 - 3) Continue to develop the Non-Native Species Manual with the input of SCAR and COMNAP on scientific and practical matters, respectively; and
 - 4) Task the Secretariat with posting the Manual in all four Treaty languages on the ATS website.
229. The Committee considered and endorsed a Resolution prepared by ICG participants which encourages the use and further development of the Manual.

CEP Advice to the ATCM

230. The Committee recommends the ATCM to adopt the Manual on Non native Species in Antarctica by means of a resolution.

231. COMNAP introduced WP 12, *Raising awareness of non-native species introductions: Workshop results and checklists for supply chain managers*, submitted in conjunction with SCAR. The Working Paper made two recommendations to the CEP, including that the CEP consider the inclusion of the checklist to reduce the risk of introduction of non-native species into the proposed "Non-Native Species Manual".
232. Most Members highlighted the practicality of the ranking of actions and the style of the checklist.
233. China expressed its concerns about the applicability of some of the points proposed in the checklist. In particular, China noted that some aspects of the checklist are too strict to be implemented, and they might benefit from review to be more practical.
234. COMNAP thanked China, and noted that, even though some of the standards proposed in the checklist would be difficult to achieve, the adoption of these standards would be voluntary.
235. Argentina noted that these checklists had been developed after extensive consultations amongst COMNAP members.
236. IAATO and some members of COMNAP intend to use the checklists next summer season.
237. The Meeting extended its congratulations to COMNAP and SCAR for the development of this comprehensive work in WP 12. The Chair reminded the Meeting that the list is intended to advise and facilitate the work of operators, but it is not mandatory to adopt it.
238. The CEP approved the recommendations including addition of the checklists into the "Non-Native Species Manual", and recommended the addition of the comments made by China.
239. SCAR introduced *WP 53: Measures to Reduce the Risk of Non-Native Species Introductions to the Antarctic Region Associated with Fresh Foods*. SCAR recommended the CEP discuss the adoption of these measures.

240. China expressed concern with Section 3b) which recommended fresh food in transit to the Antarctic by boat or air should be accompanied with insecticide spray to eradicate insects. China noted that insecticides are banned substances on aircraft due to their flammable nature, and therefore the recommendation could compromise onboard safety. Chile noted that there may be an alternative to flammable aerosol insecticides which would minimise the concern to onboard safety.
241. The United Kingdom supported the adoption of the three main recommendations and Annex A of the report, while noting that the measures are not proposed to become mandatory.
242. Argentina was concerned with the report's use of the words 'banning' and 'prohibiting' of the transport of fresh fruit or food in the Antarctic region. Argentina noted clarification was needed in reference to section 2c) as 'seasonal produce' was a confusing term given that Parties receive food from both hemispheres. Argentina also noted irradiation of food by UV light would shorten its durability, and it strongly opposes gamma irradiation of produce. It suggested that SCAR/COMNAP medical group could be consulted on this issue.
243. The United States suggested the adoption of these measures would require too much discussion and clarification during this meeting for all Members to express concerns. The United States noted that the intersessional review of these measures would be a good task to ensure the continued work of the Non-Native Species ICG, and suggested inclusion of COMNAP to explore practical issues, such as food safety, transport safety and nutrition of people.
244. South Africa highlighted its concern with biosecurity matters, reflecting that practical and cost-saving measures would have the most chance of success.
245. New Zealand thanked SCAR for its work and noted that the guidelines could be included in the annex to the Manual as a resource and that could be applied as appropriate to assist Parties in meeting their requirements under Annex II.
246. COMNAP accepted the invitation to participate in the discussions and asked for more time to consider the practical consequences of such measures.
247. SCAR thanked all Members for their comments, and added several points of clarification. These measures were at the draft stage, and will require consultation on content and development of wording before formal adoption. The banning of fresh produce is not intended to be part of this approach, as these guidelines are designed only to mitigate the introduction of non-native species.
248. The Committee accepted an offer from SCAR to moderate an informal discussion on WP 53 during the intersessional period with the intention of submitting a revised paper to CEP XV.
249. Australia introduced IP 68 *Alien Species Database*, jointly submitted with SCAR, recalling the Committee's earlier agreement to encourage use of the Alien Species database maintained by the Australian Antarctic Data Centre (AADC) as the central repository of Antarctic alien species records, and reporting on work by the AADC to enhance the database to provide a standard online form for entering records and to allow images to be uploaded. Australia noted that the Non-Native Species Manual reiterated the Committee's earlier agreements, and encouraged Members to submit information on non-native species to the database.
250. In response to an enquiry from Chile, Australia assured the Committee that the database could be modified to accommodate a continuous record for all non-native species events.
251. The United Kingdom suggested that the information contained in IP 50 *Colonisation status of known non-native species in the Antarctic terrestrial environment (updated 2011)* could be added to the database.
252. Other papers submitted under this item included:

- IP 32 *Report on IPY Oslo Science Conference Session on Non-Native Species* (France)
- IP 26 *Progress Report on the 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).

8b) Specially Protected Species

253. No papers were submitted under this item.

8c) Other Annex II Matters

254. Germany introduced WP 38 *Antarctic Discussion Forum of Competent Authorities (DFCA) – Impacts of underwater sound to Antarctic waters*. Germany offered to host a 2nd Workshop of the DFCA in the autumn of 2011 on the impacts of anthropogenic underwater sound on the Antarctic environment. This would follow on from the 1st workshop held in 2006 and reported in XXIX ATCM IP 43.
255. The Committee thanked Germany for its paper and indicated an interest in continuing to develop its understanding of this topic.
256. Some Members expressed an interest in attending the proposed workshop. Other Members stated that, based on the highly technical nature of underwater acoustics, the DCFA was not the most appropriate forum through which the CEP should be exploring this issue at this point in time.
257. The United Kingdom drew a clear distinction between scientific evidence, which was the basis for this Committee’s work, and the activities of Competent Authorities which were not necessarily relevant. However, the United Kingdom noted the value of holding such a workshop to cover a range of topics, including some topics to be discussed by other working groups. Russia noted that this topic had been fully explored at previous meetings. The USA noted that Competent Authorities are not under the jurisdiction of the CEP and therefore the CEP should not consider this question. Instead, the United States proposed that advice should be sought from SCAR and noted the importance of understanding the underwater noise profile which would benefit from monitoring. ASOC reminded the Committee that it had provided four IPs on this subject to earlier meetings and would be happy to provide an update for the Committee.
258. The Committee welcomed offers from SCAR and ASOC to submit a summary of new information on this topic to the CEP XV in order to facilitate further discussion.
259. SCAR introduced IP 33 *SCAR’s code of conduct for the exploration and research of subglacial aquatic environments* and IP 53 *SCAR’s Code of Conduct for the Use of Animals for Scientific Purposes in Antarctica*.
260. The United Kingdom noted that IP 33 had been useful in the drafting of its CEE on the exploration of Subglacial Lake Ellsworth.
261. In reference to IP 53, the United Kingdom expressed the view that researchers should not wait until the end of an experiment to painlessly kill animals used for scientific purposes that would otherwise suffer permanent pain, distress, discomfort, or disablement that could not be relieved.
262. Other papers submitted under this item:

- IP 27 *Progress Report on the Research Project 'Whale Monitoring Antarctica'* (Germany)
- IP29 *Potential of Technical Measures to Reduce the Acoustical Effects of Airguns* (Germany)
- IP 94 *Use of dogs in the context of commemorative centennial expedition* (Norway)

Item 9 Environmental Reporting

263. The United Kingdom introduced WP 15 rev. 1 *Remote Sensing Techniques for Improved Monitoring of Environment and Climate Change in Antarctica*.
264. The United Kingdom recommended that the CEP:
1. note and endorse the potential for remote sensing to contribute significantly to future environmental monitoring programmes, including in the context of protected area management and monitoring the impacts of climate change;
 2. consider how else the utilisation of remote sensing data can support the CEP's work and that of the ATCM; and
 3. continue to explore opportunities to use and investigate new monitoring applications.
265. Many Members expressed their acknowledgement to the United Kingdom for the preparation of WP 15 rev. 1 and showed support for the recommendations listed.
266. Some of these Members also highlighted that WP 15 does not cover several alternative examples of remote sensing, or other techniques that could be used for remote collection of data or monitoring aside from satellite derived data. Norway suggested that work should be done to examine the data sets and monitoring themes in ongoing international remote sensing initiatives, and bring this information back to the CEP for reference, and would be happy to work with other Members in this regard.
267. Some Members also made comments on the difficulties of using remote sensing for monitoring. The Russian Federation announced that it has submitted IP 98 (ATCM agenda item 13) on the use of different techniques for monitoring, which will compare the advantages and limitations of several different techniques.
268. Germany pointed out how useful satellite monitoring could be in determining trends in climate change.
269. Australia recommended information exchange of the current and planned remote sensing activities of all Members in the Antarctic region, to share experience, data and results and avoid any duplication between the studies being undertaken. Chile and Ecuador expressed their agreement with this recommendation. Ecuador mentioned that it would appreciate any collaboration for database sharing, especially on long time series data that are not currently available for all Members.
270. Several Members informed the Committee of their use of remote sensing techniques each season for environmental monitoring purposes, some which are not always satellite based due to the high expense. Argentina informed the Committee of the recent launch of a new satellite which will allow for more effective monitoring of the Antarctic and sub-Antarctic regions. India also informed the Committee about its launch of polar satellites.
271. The Committee agreed to support the recommendations of WP 15 rev. 1, with the addition of another recommendation suggested by Australia on encouraging information exchange to benefit all Parties that work in the Antarctic region, and avoid duplication of efforts. The Chair highlighted that other techniques of remote collection of data or monitoring, other than

272. Romania introduced IP 35 *Environmental Monitoring and Ecological Activities in Antarctica, 2010-2012*.
273. SCAR introduced IP 51 *The Southern Ocean Observing System (SOOS): An Update*, submitted in conjunction with Australia. Australia noted that despite the importance of the Southern Ocean it was one of the least studied marine areas in the world. Recognising that several Parties are already closely engaged in this programme Australia encouraged all Parties to support and contribute to the SOOS programme. Australia announced that it was hosting the secretariat for this programme. The United States mentioned its support for the SOOS programme, and stated that it will collaborate on this effort.

Item 10 Inspection Reports

274. Japan introduced WP 1 *Inspection undertaken by Japan in accordance with Article VII of the Antarctic Treaty and Article XIV of the Protocol on Environmental Protection* and IP 4 containing the full inspection report. During its inspection in January and February 2010, Japan visited six stations: Maitri Station (India), Princess Elisabeth Station (Belgium), Neumayer Station III (Germany), SANAE IV Base (South Africa), Troll Station (Norway) and Novolazarevskaya Station (Russian Federation).
275. Japan introduced the result of inspection including waste management and disposal, treatment of sewage and domestic liquid wastes. Following the introduction of the results, Japan has recommended that at some stations, waste water treatment and oil tank facilities etc. should be improved.
276. Australia introduced WP 51 *Australian Antarctic Treaty and Environmental Protocol inspections: January 2010 and January 2011* and IP 39 and IP 40 containing the full inspections reports. In January 2010, Australian observers conducted inspections of Syowa Station (Japan), Druzhnaya IV and Soyuz Stations (Russian Federation) and Mount Harding Antarctic Specially Protected Area (ASPA) 168, as well as an aerial observation of Molodezhnaya Station (Russian Federation). In January 2011, Australian observers conducted on-ground inspections of Gondwana Station (Germany) and Vostok Station (Russian Federation), and an aerial observation of Leningradskaya Station (Russian Federation).
277. Australia noted that the inspection teams were impressed by the evident commitment to science, as well as activities to remove accumulated wastes at a number of stations inspected. Australia noted that its inspections had raised some areas of environmental concern, and referred the meeting to its recommendations that Parties should: ensure current facilities operate in compliance with the Protocol; maintain and regularly assess temporarily unoccupied facilities to ensure that environmental harm is not occurring; give due consideration to the removal of facilities and equipment no longer in use and the removal of accumulated waste materials; make efforts to share with the operating Party information on unoccupied facilities; and, share knowledge and experience about addressing the challenges of dealing with the legacies of past activities.
278. Those Parties whose stations were inspected thanked Japan and Australia for their visits and for providing them with constructive feedback.
279. The Russian Federation welcomed the outcomes of the reports as useful and constructive, and noted that the outcomes would assist Russia in taking specific actions. Russia informed the meeting that in response to the observations made by Australia's inspection team in 2010, it had sent a team to Soyuz Station to conduct repairs in the 2010/11 season. Russia offered to

- report at a future meeting on additional action taken in relation to issues identified. The Russian Federation referred to *WP 55 On strategy for the development of the Russian Federation activities in the Antarctic for the period until 2020 and longer-term perspective* which provided further details of its plans for addressing some issues identified at the stations that had been inspected.
280. The Committee agreed that inspections are highly valuable, noting that they facilitated the effective implementation of the Protocol.
281. ASOC thanked Australia and Japan for their inspections. As noted in XXVI ATCM /IP 118 rev 1 produced by ASOC and UNEP, some sites and facilities have not received inspection, and the inspections conducted by Japan and Australia help to fill that gap. According to ASOC, the inspections reports further confirm some of the conclusions of ASOC's XXXIV ATCM/IP 89 rev.1 that there are poor implementation standards of the Protocol. ASOC recommended that the findings of these inspections be considered by the Parties that had been inspected and also in the future work of the CEP.
282. Russia welcomed the outcomes of the reports and suggested that future inspections should take into account national and cultural aspects, highlighting that email exchanges in preparation for Australia's inspection of Vostok station had coincided with the Orthodox Christmas.
283. With respect to observations made on the need for stronger waste water management measures, particularly at inland stations, the Committee called on COMNAP to submit information on best practices on waste water management to CEPXV. It was also noted that the Committee had previously acknowledged the practical challenges in meeting the requirements of the Protocol in this regard.
284. As a response to Japan's observation with regards to use of alternative energy at stations, Norway drew the Committee's attention to IP 74 *Assessment of wind energy potential at the Norwegian research station Troll*, noting the potential for harnessing wind and solar energy in Antarctic stations.
285. Given that the Committee had made no specific policies on the use of hydroponics at Antarctic stations, Argentina proposed that the CEP initiate some informal discussions on this matter.
286. Some Members remarked that, while they endeavored to fulfill their Protocol obligations, it was difficult and expensive to fully maintain and regularly assess temporarily unoccupied facilities, as well as managing waste and deteriorating structures.
287. In this regard, the United States noted that it has had some successful experience in removing material from sites of past activities and announced that it would present an information paper on this to CEP XV.
288. The Committee supported Australia's recommendation, on how Parties might deal with the legacies of past activities, and the maintenance of long-established facilities. It also agreed to incorporate this into the five-year work plan.
289. Japan expressed its hope to all the Parties inspected that the report be fully utilized to improve their facilities in Antarctic stations for environmental protection to implement Madrid Protocol in the near future.

Item 11 Cooperation with other Organisations

290. Papers submitted under this agenda item:

- IP 10 *The Annual Report for 2010 of the Council of Managers of National Antarctic Programs (COMNAP)*
- IP 31 *Report by the SC-CAMLR Observer to the Fourteenth Meeting of the Committee for Environmental Protection (CCAMLR)*
- IP 54 *Summary of SCAR's Strategic Plan 2011-2016 (SCAR)*
- IP 57 *Report of the CEP Observer to SC-CAMLR's Working Group on Ecosystem Monitoring and Management (WG-EMM) (CCAMLR)*

Item 12 General Matters

291. In response to a request from ATCM XXXIII for advice on environmental issues related to the practicality of repair and remediation of environmental damage, Australia introduced WP 28 *Environmental issues related to the practicality of repair or remediation of environmental damage*. The paper was intended to stimulate discussion and assist the CEP to provide a timely and helpful response to Decision 4 (2010), and identified eight points that Australia considered the CEP should build on in preparing such a response.
292. The Committee thanked Australia for initiating work on a challenging and important issue and expressed an interest that this issue be discussed by the CEP.
293. The Netherlands suggested that the topic on repair or remediation of environmental damage be integrated into the CEP's Five-Year Work Plan. The Netherlands and ASOC also raised concerns that some approaches could allow considerable delay in reacting to a problem.
294. ASOC further noted poor practices with regards to abandoned facilities and waste management reported at this ATCM in WP 1, WP 51 and IP 24.
295. Argentina expressed their support to all points presented in the WP 28 and referred to the IP 17 presented to the ATCM XXXIV where studies describing the development of a process for bioremediation of hydrocarbon contaminated soils, that exhibited positive results, were briefly described. Argentina also mentioned that bioremediation processes have been included in the action plan against oil spills for Jubany station.
296. In response to a request from the Committee, SCAR agreed to provide advice to the CEP on technical matters relating to repair and remediation of environmental damage.
297. The Committee encouraged Members to submit papers and proposals on this issue to CEP XV with a view to establishing an ICG on repair or remediation of environmental damage at that meeting.
298. Other papers submitted under this agenda item:
- IP 48 *Thala Valley Waste Removal (Australia)*
 - IP 49 *Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Initiatives at Australia's Antarctic Stations (Australia)*
 - IP 61 *The SCAR Antarctic Climate Evolution (ACE) Programme (SCAR)*
 - IP 95 *Paying for Ecosystem Services of Antarctica? (Netherlands)*
 - IP 127 *The Construction of an Orthodox Chapel at Vernadsky Station (Ukraine)*

299. The CEP noted that the ATCM had considered WP 24 *Progress Report on the Intersessional Contact Group on Review of ATCM Recommendations* (Argentina), and had requested advice on outstanding components of the following Recommendations that address environmental matters other than area protection and management:
- Recommendation III-8
 - Recommendation III-10
 - Recommendation IV-22
 - Recommendation X-7
 - Recommendation XII-3
 - Recommendation XIII-4
 - Recommendation XIV-3
300. An open-ended contact group was convened by Australia to consider whether, in the Committee's view, these Recommendations could be no longer current.
301. The Committee supported the advice of the contact group. It noted that the outstanding components of Recommendations III-10, IV-22, X-7, XII-3, XIII-4 related to encouraging SCAR to provide advice to inform the Parties' deliberations on: conservation of Antarctic fauna and flora; matters relating to Antarctic pelagic sealing; monitoring of hydrocarbons in the marine environment; environmental impacts of scientific and logistic activities; and waste management.
302. The Committee agreed that these Recommendations were out of date and could be considered no longer current, but noted SCAR's ongoing and valuable role in providing scientific advice to the ATCM and CEP, as embodied in Articles 10.2 and 12 of the Environmental Protocol.
303. With respect to Recommendation XIII-4, the Committee noted that COMNAP would be best placed to provide advice regarding procedures for waste management.
304. The Committee noted that the guidelines for scientific drilling presented in Recommendation XIV-3 had not been replaced or superseded. It agreed that, in accordance with Article 8 and Annex I of the Protocol, such activities would be subject to prior environmental impact assessment, but that there could be some benefit in retaining information to guide the planning, conduct and environmental assessment of drilling activities. The Committee agreed to give further attention to this matter, with due consideration to the experiences arising from several existing and planned drilling activities.
305. The Committee noted that, in practical terms, the provisions of the Environmental Protocol and its Annexes had superseded the provisions of the Agreed Measures for the Conservation of Antarctic Fauna and Flora appended to Recommendation III-8.

CEP advice to the ATCM:

306. **The Committee advises that the following Recommendations referred by the ATCM for its consideration could be considered no longer current.**
- **Recommendation III-8**
 - **Recommendation III-10**
 - **Recommendation IV-22**
 - **Recommendation X-7**
 - **Recommendation XII-3**
 - **Recommendation XIII-4**
307. **The Committee further advises that elements of the Guidelines for Scientific Drilling in the Antarctic Treaty Area presented in Recommendation XIV-3 have not been replaced or superseded, and that there could be some benefit in retaining such guidelines. The**

Committee will give further attention to this matter, with due consideration to the experiences arising from several existing and planned drilling activities.

Item 13 Election of Officers

308. The Committee congratulated Verónica Vallejos from Chile on her re-election as Vice- chair for a new two-year term.

Item 14 Preparation for the Next Meeting

309. Australia introduced WP 8 *Proposed schedule for the 35th Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting, Hobart, 2012*.
310. While ATCM XXXV would be held over an eight-day period, Australia noted that the duration of the CEP meeting had not been reduced.
311. The Committee adopted the provisional agenda for CEP XV (Appendix 2).

Item 15 Adoption of the Report

312. The Committee adopted its Report.

Item 16 Closing of the Meeting

313. The Chair closed the Meeting on Friday 24th June 2011.

CEP XIV Agenda and Summary of Documents

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING	
2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	
SP1	<i>ATCM XXXIV AND CEP XIV AGENDA AND SCHEDULE.</i>
3. STRATEGIC DISCUSSION ON THE FUTURE WORK OF THE CEP	
IP 89 ASOC	<i>THE ANTARCTIC ENVIRONMENTAL PROTOCOL, 1991-2011.</i> This paper reflects on Antarctic environmental protection since the signature of the Protocol on Environmental Protection, noting significant accomplishments, issues, events, and challenges.
4. OPERATION OF THE CEP	
WP 25 Germany and USA	<i>TIMELY SUBMISSION OF PAPERS IN ADVANCE OF ATCMs.</i> This paper considers that the ATCM and CEP can improve the efficiency and effectiveness of their work by including in their Rules of Procedure clear provisions related to the submission of papers prior to ATCMs. It proposes to provide firm deadlines for the submission of WPs and incentives for meeting those deadlines, and to replace the current guidelines contained in Decision 3 (2009) with the adoption of a new set of procedures.
WP 36 Australia, France and New Zealand	<i>A PROPOSED NEW APPROACH TO THE HANDLING OF INFORMATION PAPERS..</i> This paper proposes modifications to the categories of official document for the ATCM and CEP, with the objective of ensuring a focus on Working Papers raising substantive matter for discussion and/or decision, while retaining a formal means for sharing valuable information between Parties and other meeting participants. A draft Decision and suggested revision to the <i>Guidelines for the Submission, Translation and Distribution of Documents for the ATCM and the CEP</i> are presented.
IP71 Italy	<i>ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 17 OF THE PROTOCOL ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION TO THE ANTARCTIC TREATY. 2009-2010.</i>
IP 93 Ukraine	<i>ANNUAL REPORT PURSUANT TO ARTICLE 17 OF THE PROTOCOL ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION TO THE ANTARCTIC TREATY</i>
IP 113 UNEP & ASOC	<i>REVIEW OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MADRID PROTOCOL: ANNUAL REPORT BY PARTIES (ARTICLE 17).</i> This paper addresses the annual reporting duty set out in Article 17 of the Madrid Protocol, analyzing the level of compliance by Parties with their annual reporting duty since the entry into force of the Madrid Protocol.
5. CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS FOR THE ENVIRONMENT: STRATEGIC APPROACH	
WP 43 UK and Norway	<i>DEVELOPING A SIMPLE METHODOLOGY FOR CLASSIFYING ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREAS ACCORDING TO THEIR VULNERABILITY TO CLIMATE CHANGE.</i> Considering that the protected areas system is an important tool for managing the implications of climate change, the UK and Norway propose a first attempt to develop a methodology to classify existing protected areas according to their vulnerability and risk to climate change.
WP 44 UK and Norway	<i>PROGRESS REPORT ON ATME ON CLIMATE CHANGE.</i> The UK and Norway have developed this paper to facilitate the ATCM's ongoing consideration of the conclusions and recommendations arising from the 2010 Climate Change ATME. The summary table at Annex A records the actions taken to date by the CEP and the ATCM against each of the 30 ATME recommendations. The UK and Norway propose that the ATCM task the Secretariat to maintain and update this table to inform future discussions on the ATME recommendations, until they have all been closed.
IP 52 SCAR	<i>ANTARCTIC CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE ENVIRONMENT – 2011 UPDATE.</i> This paper is the second update to the ATCM since the publication of the SCAR Antarctic Climate Change and the Environment report, and highlights some recent advances in Antarctic climate science and associated impacts on the environment.
IP 56	<i>MARINE SPATIAL PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT UNDER THE ANTARCTIC TREATY SYSTEM: NEW OPPORTUNITIES</i>

IUCN	<i>FOR IMPLEMENTATION AND COORDINATION.</i> IUCN requires that Parties work closely with CCAMLR to identify relevant, broad-scale areas which are of interest to both bodies.
IP 65 United States	<i>FRONTIERS IN UNDERSTANDING CLIMATE CHANGE AND POLAR ECOSYSTEMS WORKSHOP REPORT.</i> This paper informs on a Workshop attended by polar and non-polar scientists to explore whether there are new capabilities available to study ecosystems in different ways that might shed light on questions related to species movement, changes in seasonality, feedbacks and how changes in these patterns might be related to climate change.
IP 83 ASOC	<i>AN ANTARCTIC CLIMATE CHANGE COMMUNICATION PLAN.</i> In this paper, ASOC provides a draft communication plan to help implement Recommendation 2 from the ATME on Climate Change.
IP 88 ASOC	<i>OCEAN ACIDIFICATION AND THE SOUTHERN OCEAN.</i> ASOC informs on the impact of acidification on the Southern Ocean's chemistry and organisms. It recommends increased research on the uptake and distribution of CO ₂ in the Southern Ocean, as well as the establishment of a network of MPAs and marine reserves as a tool for eliminating other stressors in to help build ecosystem resilience.
IP 103 IAATO	<i>IAATO'S CLIMATE CHANGE WORKING GROUP: REPORT OF PROGRESS.</i> This paper reports on the objectives and activities of the IAATO's Climate Change WG, matters discussed in the last IAATO General Meeting, and initiatives for the future.
6. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT	
a) Draft Comprehensive Environmental Evaluations	
WP 7 Australia	<i>REPORT OF THE INTERSESSIONAL OPEN-ENDED CONTACT GROUP TO CONSIDER THE DRAFT CEE FOR THE "CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF THE JANG BOGO STATION, TERRA NOVA BAY, ANTARCTICA".</i> This paper informs the result of the intersessional review by an ICG coordinated by Australia, according to the CEP Procedures, of the draft CEE prepared for the new Korean station.
WP 14 Norway	<i>REPORT OF THE INTERSESSIONAL OPEN-ENDED CONTACT GROUP TO CONSIDER THE DRAFT CEE FOR THE "PROPOSED EXPLORATION OF SUBGLACIAL LAKE ELLSWORTH, ANTARCTICA".</i> This paper reports the results of the intersessional review by an ICG coordinated by Norway, according to the CEP procedures, of the draft CEE prepared for the proposed exploration of Subglacial Lake Ellsworth.
WP 16 United Kingdom	<i>DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (CEE) FOR THE PROPOSED EXPLORATION OF SUBGLACIAL LAKE ELLSWORTH, ANTARCTICA.</i> This paper describes the antecedents and objectives of the exploration of Subglacial Lake Ellsworth and the process of the preparation, circulation, and conclusions of the draft CEE.
WP 42 Republic of Korea	<i>THE DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF THE JANG BOGO ANTARCTIC RESEARCH STATION, TERRA NOVA BAY, ANTARCTIC.</i> This paper informs on the preparation and circulation process of the Draft CEE, as well as its contents, and includes the non-technical summary as an attachment.
IP 13 United Kingdom	<i>THE DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (CEE) FOR THE PROPOSED EXPLORATION OF SUBGLACIAL LAKE ELLSWORTH, ANTARCTICA.</i> This paper presents the complete version of the Draft CEE.
IP 19 Rep. of Korea	<i>THE DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF THE JANG BOGO ANTARCTIC RESEARCH STATION, TERRA NOVA BAY, ANTARCTICA.</i> This paper presents the complete version of the Draft CEE.
IP 76 Rep. of Korea	<i>THE INITIAL RESPONSES TO THE COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION FOR CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF THE JANG BOGO ANTARCTIC RESEARCH STATION, TERRA NOVA BAY, ANTARCTICA.</i> This paper provides preliminary responses to several comments raised by Parties on the Draft CEE.
b) Other EIA Matters	
WP 54 Russian Federation	<i>TECHNOLOGY FOR INVESTIGATING WATER STRATA OF SUBGLACIAL LAKE VOSTOK.</i> This paper informs that during February 2011 the ice borehole at Vostok station closely approached the ice/water interface, and that the opening to lake water will more likely occur in the summer season of 2011-12 using the technology designed by the Russian Federation in 2001, and in compliance with the Final CEE approved in 2010.
SP 5 rev 1 Secretariat	<i>ANNUAL LIST OF INITIAL ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATIONS (IEE) AND COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATIONS (CEE) PREPARED BETWEEN APRIL 1ST 2010 AND MARCH 31ST 2011.</i> The Secretariat will report on the list of IEEs and CEES for the most recent reporting period.
IP 64 India	<i>FINAL COMPREHENSIVE ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION (CEE) OF NEW INDIAN RESEARCH STATION AT LARSEMANN HILLS, ANTARCTICA AND UPDATE ON CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY.</i> India informs on the incorporation of suggestions received regarding the Final version of the CEE and its circulation to Parties, and on the Station construction process.

IP 72 USA	<i>METHODOLOGY FOR CLEAN ACCESS TO THE SUBGLACIAL ENVIRONMENT ASSOCIATED WITH THE WHILLANS ICE STREAM.</i> This paper informs on a project focused on addressing the potential for the West Antarctic Ice Sheet to make a large contribution to near-future global sea level rise, and the presence of microorganisms and microbial habitats in dark and cold subglacial aquatic environments.
IP 84 ASOC	<i>ANTARCTIC TOURISM – WHAT NEXT? KEY ISSUES TO ADDRESS WITH BINDING RULES.</i> This paper addresses three issues ASOC has identified as requiring particular attention from regulatory entities: Antarctic tourism as a multi-scalar, dynamic issue; environmental pressures from tourism; and the application of existing instruments.
IP 87 ASOC	<i>LAND-BASED TOURISM IN ANTARCTICA.</i> This paper examines the interface between commercial land-based tourism and the use of national program infrastructure, as well as recent developments in land-based tourism.
IP 123 Ecuador	<i>ESTUDIO DE IMPACTO AMBIENTAL EX-POST DE LA ESTACIÓN CIENTÍFICA ECUATORIANA “PEDRO VICENTE MALDONADO”. ISLA GREENWICH-SHETLAND DEL SUR-ANTÁRTIDA, 2010-2011.</i> This paper informs on the environmental impact assessment associated with the XIV and XV Ecuadorian Antarctic expeditions, and presents an Environmental Management Plan to conduct Ecuadorian activities in Antarctica.
7. AREA PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT	
a) Management Plans	
i. <u>Draft management plans which had been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans</u>	
WP 47 Australia	<i>SUBSIDIARY GROUP ON MANAGEMENT PLANS – REPORT ON TERMS OF REFERENCE #1 TO #3: REVIEW OF DRAFT MANAGEMENT PLANS.</i> The SGMP reviewed one draft ASPA management plan referred by the CEP for intersessional review. The SGMP recommends that the CEP approve the revised management plan prepared by the United Kingdom, Chile and Spain for ASPA 126 Byers Peninsula.
ii. <u>Draft revised management plans which had not been reviewed by the Subsidiary Group on Management Plans</u>	
WP 3 France	<i>REVIEW OF THE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No. 120, POINTE-GÉOLOGIE ARCHIPELAGO, TERRE ADÉLIE.</i> France informs on the five-yearly review of the management plan for ASPA 120 noting that only minor changes have been made in order to clarify the text and to remove some of the ambiguities present in the previous version. It is recommended that the CEP approve the attached revised Management Plan for this Area.
WP 4 France	<i>MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No. 166, PORT-MARTIN, TERRE ADÉLIE. PROPOSAL TO EXTEND THE EXISTING MANAGEMENT PLAN.</i> France has conducted the five-yearly review of the management plan for ASPA 166 and, in light of this review, it suggests to renew the management plan without any modification for a period of five years.
WP 6 USA and Chile	<i>REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No. 149 CAPE SHIRREFF AND SAN TELMO ISLAND, LIVINGSTON ISLAND, SOUTH SHETLAND ISLANDS.</i> This paper informs that only minor changes were made on the revised Management Plan, including a brief introduction, updates to the agreed provisions under CCAMLR, a requirement for National programs operating in the Area, and editorial corrections.
WP 9 United States	<i>REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No. 122 ARRIVAL HEIGHTS, HUT POINT PENINSULA, ROSS ISLAND.</i> Some major changes were introduced in this Management Plan, including several revisions of the boundaries, a brief introduction, new values, amendments to some maps, descriptions of the Area and access to the Area, and editorial changes.
WP 23 United Kingdom	<i>REVISION OF THE MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA (ASPA) No. 140 PARTS OF DECEPTION ISLAND, SOUTH SHETLAND ISLANDS.</i> The proposed changes to the revised Management Plan include an introduction, revision of boundaries, access to the area, maps, and the inclusion of photographs. Given the substantial changes introduced in the revised version, the UK asks the Committee to send this MP for intersessional review for the SGMP.
WP 29 Australia	<i>REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No. 167, HAWKER ISLAND, PRINCESS ELIZABETH LAND.</i> Australia informs that it has determined that only minor amendments to the Management Plan are required, including an introduction, some additional requirements for visitors, improved maps, reference to the EDA, and updates to the bibliography. Australia recommends that the CEP approve the revised Management Plan.
WP 31 New Zealand	<i>REVISION OF MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No. 116: NEW COLLEGE VALLEY, CAUGHLEY BEACH, CAPE BIRD, ROSS ISLAND.</i> New Zealand informs that the revised version of the Management Plan includes updated information on vegetation cover, invertebrates, and glacier boundaries, and proposes that the CEP approve the revised Management Plan.
WP 33	<i>REVISION OF MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA (ASPA) No. 131: CANADA</i>

New Zealand	<i>GLACIER, LAKE FRYXELL, TAYLOR VALLEY, VICTORIA LAND.</i> New Zealand informs that for the revised Management Plan it assessed the glacier boundary location, lake edge, and meltwater streams in relation to potential changes due to climate change, and conducted a vegetation survey to ensure that the algal biodiversity of the Area is well characterized. New Zealand proposes that the CEP approve the revised Management Plan.
WP 39 UK and NZ	<i>REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY MANAGED AREA No. 2 MCMURDO DRY VALLEYS, SOUTHERN VICTORIA LAND.</i> This paper informs on several important modifications introduced in the ASMA 2 Management Plan during the review process. Changes were made in the boundaries of the Area, the description of values to be protected, restrictions to activities within the Area, maps and photographs.
WP 50 Italy	<i>REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA (ASPAs) N° 165 EDMONSON POINT, ROSS SEA.</i> Italy informs that boundaries, maps and descriptions of the Area remain without changes and that only minor changes were made in the revised Management Plan, mainly related to a review of activities conducted in the Area, an update to the population numbers of breeding birds and permit conditions, and an introduction of key management issues related to the protection of potentially sensitive features of the site.
WP 58 Russian Federation	<i>REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA No. 127 "HASWELL ISLAND" (HASWELL ISLAND AND ADJACENT EMPEROR PENGUIN ROOKERY ON FAST ICE) REVISED MANAGEMENT PLAN.</i> Russia informs that only minor changes were introduced in the revised Version of the Management Plan for ASPA 127.
iii. <u>New draft management plans for protected/managed areas</u>	
iv. <u>Other matters relating to management plans for protected/managed areas</u>	
WP 10 United States	<i>DEVELOPING A PLAN FOR SPECIAL PROTECTION AT TAYLOR GLACIER AND BLOOD FALLS, TAYLOR VALLEY, MCMURDO DRY VALLEYS.</i> The United States proposes the establishment of an International Working Group to discuss area protection at Taylor Glacier and Blood Falls and to develop a draft ASPA Management Plan to be submitted to the CEP XV in 2012.
WP 13 Australia	<i>SUBSIDIARY GROUP ON MANAGEMENT PLANS – REPORT ON TERMS OF REFERENCE #4 AND #5: IMPROVING MANAGEMENT PLANS AND THE PROCESS FOR THEIR INTERSESSIONAL REVIEW.</i> This paper reports on tasks undertaken by the SGMP during the intersessional period. In particular, it reports the revision of <i>Guide to the Preparation of Management Plans for Antarctic Specially Protected Areas</i> , the finalisation of a template suggesting standard wording for ASPA Management Plans, and the development of an outline for the CEP Workshop on Marine and Terrestrial ASMAs.
WP 18 United Kingdom	<i>PROPOSED MONITORING ACTIVITIES WITHIN ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA (ASPAs) No. 107 EMPEROR ISLAND, DION ISLANDS, MARGUERITE BAY, ANTARCTIC PENINSULA.</i> Noting that the continued existence of the emperor penguin colony within the ASPA is now in doubt, the UK proposes delaying the revision of the current ASPA Management Plan for 5 years to enable the status of the colony to be confirmed, after which appropriate management action will be considered.
SP 7 Secretariat	<i>STATUS OF ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREA AND ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY MANAGED AREA MANAGEMENT PLANS.</i> Information on the status of ASPA and ASMA management plans according to the review requirements of Annex V to the Protocol.
IP 73 USA	<i>AMUNDSEN-SCOTT SOUTH POLE STATION, SOUTH POLE ANTARCTICA SPECIALLY MANAGED AREA (ASMA No. 5) 2011 MANAGEMENT REPORT.</i> This paper summarizes the continuing challenges in managing diverse activities in the ASMA, particularly in relation to the expected increase in non-governmental activities associated with celebrations of the Centenary of Amundsen and Scott reaching the South Pole.
IP 79 Australia ,China India, Romania Russia	<i>REPORT OF THE LARSEMANN HILLS ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY MANAGED AREA (ASMA) MANAGEMENT GROUP.</i> Parties active in the Larsemann Hills established a Management Group to oversee the implementation of the ASMA Management Plan. This paper gives a brief report on the Management Group's activities during 2010-11.
IP 109 Rep. of Korea & Argentina	<i>COOPERATION MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES AT ASPAs IN 25 DE MAYO (KING GEORGE) ISLAND, SOUTH SHETLAND ISLANDS.</i> This paper informs on activities between the Republic of Korea and Argentina to initiate a review of the environmental management in two ASPAs on King George Island, South Shetland Islands: ASPA 132 and ASPA 171.
IP 115 Rep. of Korea	<i>FAUNA SURVEY OF THE ASPA 171 NAREBSKI POINT, ASPA 150 ARDLEY ISLAND AND ASPA 132 POTTER PENINSULA IN 2010-11.</i> This paper informs on a survey aimed to formulate a comprehensive management plan for the ASPA 171.
IP131 Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain, UK &	<i>DECEPTION ISLAND SPECIALLY MANAGED AREA (ASMA) MANAGEMENT GROUP REPORT</i> This paper presents a summary of the activities undertaken within the Deception Island ASMA, and the work of the Management Group to fulfil the objectives and principles of ASMA No. 4 Management Plan during

USA	the intersessional period (2010-2011).
b) Historic Sites and Monuments	
WP 5 China	<i>PROPOSED ADDITION OF NO.1 BUILDING COMMEMORATING CHINA'S ANTARCTIC EXPEDITION AT GREAT WALL STATION TO THE LIST OF HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENT.</i> This paper proposes the addition of the first permanent building constructed by China in Antarctica as a new HSM.
WP 27 Argentina	<i>REPORT OF THE INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS ON HISTORIC SITES AND MONUMENTS.</i> This paper informs on the results of the informal discussions on Historic Sites and Monuments, which focused on both the evaluation of what is considered to be "historic" and the inclusion of the more holistic concept of "enhancement" for dealing with HSMs in Antarctica.
WP 59 Chile	<i>PROPOSAL OF MODIFICATION FOR THE HISTORIC MONUMENT NO. 82. INSTALLATION OF COMMEMORATIVE PLAQUES AT THE MONUMENT TO THE ANTARCTIC TREATY.</i> Chile informs on the installation of a commemorative plaque for the International Polar Years at the "Monument to the Antarctic Treaty" that had been erected near the Frei, Bellingshausen & Escudero bases, King George Island, according to what was set forth through Measure 3 (2007).
IP 117 Chile	<i>INAUGURACIÓN DE LA INSTALACIÓN DE PLACAS CONMEMORATIVAS EN EL MONUMENTO AL TRATADO ANTÁRTICO.</i> This paper provides the speech by Ambassador Fernando Schmidt, Deputy Foreign Minister of Chile, at the unveiling of the plaques commemorating the International Polar year. The plaques were installed on 1 February 2011 at the Monument to the Antarctic Treaty located on King George Island.
IP 130 Argentina	<i>UPDATE ON ENHANCEMENT ACTIVITIES FOR HSM 38 "SNOW HILL".</i> This paper summarises the work done by Argentina during the 2010/11 season to contribute to the enhancement of the Historic Site and Monument 38 "Hut on Snow Hill Island".
c) Site Guidelines	
WP 17 UK, Argentina, Chile, Norway, Spain and USA	<i>REVISION OF SITE GUIDELINES FOR WHALERS BAY, DECEPTION ISLAND, SOUTH SHETLAND ISLANDS.</i> This paper informs on the changes proposed in the revised guidelines related to a better identification of the landing area, revisions in maps and in the <i>Cautionary Notes</i> , and the correction of minor typographical errors.
WP 30 NZ and USA	<i>SITE GUIDELINES FOR THE TAYLOR VALLEY VISITOR ZONE, SOUTHERN VICTORIA LAND.</i> This paper proposes the adoption of site guidelines for this area in the McMurdo Dry Valleys which aim to minimise the risk of visitor related pressures at this site of outstanding natural and scenic value, and are to be used in conjunction with the ASMA 2 Management Plan.
WP 45 Australia	<i>REPORT OF THE OPEN-ENDED INTERSESSIONAL CONTACT GROUP ON REVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENTS OF RECOMMENDATION XVIII-1.</i> This paper informs on the conclusions of the ICG convened by Australia to: review existing environmental advice to visitors; develop revised and updated guidance; and consider how the CEP might best assess new site guidelines and periodically review existing guidelines. The ICG developed updated guidelines for visitors based on Rec. XVIII-1, which are presented for consideration by the CEP, together with a draft Resolution for adoption by the ATCM. The paper also provides recommendations on how the CEP might effectively and efficiently consider new guidelines and review existing guidelines.
WP 49 Chile and Argentina	<i>SITE GUIDELINES FOR THE NORTHEAST BEACH OF ARDLEY PENINSULA (ARDLEY ISLAND), KING GEORGE ISLAND (25 DE MAYO ISLAND), SOUTH SHETLAND ISLANDS.</i> Having received and considered the comments received by Parties during the intersessional period, Chile and Argentina propose these revised guidelines aimed to optimize management of the increasing number of visitors in the area.
WP 52 Australia	<i>VISITOR SITE GUIDE FOR MAWSON'S HUTS AND CAPE DENISON, EAST ANTARCTICA.</i> This paper proposes to adopt the site guidelines, which are aimed to assist in managing visits to this place of outstanding historical, archaeological, technical, social and aesthetic value.
IP 9 United States	<i>ANTARCTIC SITE INVENTORY: 1994-2011.</i> This paper provides updated information on the Antarctic Site Inventory, which has collected biological data and site-descriptive information in the Antarctic Peninsula since 1994.
IP 12 Bulgaria	<i>GUIDELINES OF ENVIRONMENTAL BEHAVIOR OF THE EXPEDITION PARTICIPANTS AND VISITORS TO THE BULGARIAN BASE IN ANTARCTICA.</i> This paper informs on a comprehensive set of guidelines for staff and visitors to <i>St. Kliment Ohridski Base</i> .
IP 23 USA & UK	<i>THE ANTARCTIC PENINSULA COMPENDIUM 3RD EDITION.</i> This compendium includes information on 142 sites that are regularly visited by tourists or other visitors, sites with historic census data, national research stations, sites within ASMAs, and a few ASPAs.
IP 104 IAATO	<i>PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ANTARCTIC TREATY SITE GUIDELINES FOR HANNAH POINT.</i> This paper proposes an amendment to the Site Guidelines as result of an incident in which an elephant seal, possibly disturbed by visitors, went over a cliff.

IP 105 IAATO	<i>REPORT ON IAATO OPERATOR USE OF ANTARCTIC PENINSULA LANDING SITES AND ATCM VISITOR SITE GUIDELINES, 2009-10 & 2010-11 SEASON.</i> IAATO reports that most of the landings were covered by Site Guidelines or under National Program management through their proximity to stations. IAATO suggests that two sites should adopt site guidelines for visitors in the near future.
IP 110 Ukraine	<i>UKRAINE POLICY REGARDING VISITS BY TOURISTS TO VERNADSKY STATION.</i> This paper informs on policies oriented to visitors to the station, prepared in a format of Visitor Site Guidelines, facilitating tourist vessel expedition crew comprehension and use.
IP 126 Ecuador	<i>MANEJO TURÍSTICO PARA LA ISLA BARRIENTOS.</i> This paper informs on observations of tourist activities in the vicinity of Pedro Vicente Maldonado station and a monitoring program aimed to improve guidelines for tourists in the area.
d) Human footprint and wilderness values	
WP 35 New Zealand	<i>UNDERSTANDING CONCEPTS OF FOOTPRINT AND WILDERNESS RELATED TO PROTECTION OF THE ANTARCTIC ENVIRONMENT.</i> This paper defines the terms ‘Footprint’ and “Wilderness in the Antarctic” and proposes the possibility of outlining ways in which the CEP might consider more active management of wilderness according to the Environmental Principles set out in Article 3 of the Protocol.
IP 1 United States	<i>TEMPORAL AND SPATIAL PATTERNS OF ANTHROPOGENIC DISTURBANCE AT MCMURDO STATION, ANTARCTICA.</i> This paper informs that the National Science Foundation has funded a long-term monitoring program that examines the impacts of science and logistics at McMurdo Station, Antarctica’s largest scientific base.
IP 2 United States	<i>THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF MCMURDO STATION, ANTARCTICA, AN ENVIRONMENTAL PERSPECTIVE.</i> Report based on a scientific publication on a long-term monitoring program that examines the impacts of science and logistics at McMurdo Station.
IP 43 Uruguay	<i>DISCOVERY OF HUMAN ACTIVITY REMAINS, PRE-1958 IN THE NORTH COAST OF THE KING GEORGE ISLAND / 25 DE MAYO.</i> In a beach in the north coast of King George, there were found remains of human activity pre 1958, and these are being studied in order to start a multi task research line, including the archaeology, anthropology, history and environmental protection areas.
IP 86 ASOC	<i>EVOLUTION OF FOOTPRINT: SPATIAL AND TEMPORAL DIMENSIONS OF HUMAN ACTIVITIES.</i> By providing several examples of cases of the study of human footprint in Antarctica, ASOC considers that human activities have not only a spatial dimension but also a temporal dimension and that, together, both dimensions define the <i>evolution</i> of footprint through time, which can expand or contract, and be more or less lasting depending on the case.
e) Marine Spatial Protection and Management	
SP 6 Secretariat	<i>SUMMARY OF THE WORK OF THE CEP ON MARINE PROTECTED AREAS.</i> This paper summarises discussions at the CEP on Marine Protected Areas, and analyses the cooperation between the CEP and CCAMLR through a review of CEP and Workshop reports and documents submitted to those meetings.
IP 56 IUCN	<i>MARINE SPATIAL PROTECTION AND MANAGEMENT UNDER THE ANTARCTIC TREATY SYSTEM: NEW OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION AND COORDINATION.</i> IUCN requires that Parties work closely with CCAMLR to identify relevant, broad-scale areas which are of interest to both bodies.
IP 90 ASOC	<i>THE SOUTHERN OCEAN MPA AGENDA – MATCHING WORDS AND SPIRIT WITH ACTION.</i> ASOC asks ATCPs and CCAMLR Members to make effective use of the upcoming CCAMLR Marine Protected Areas workshop to be held in August 2011 in Brest, France, to make progress on the work that is necessary to ensure that a representative system of MPAs can be designated by 2012.
IP 92 ASOC	<i>THE ROSS SEA: A VALUABLE REFERENCE AREA TO ASSESS THE EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE.</i> This paper proposes that the Ross Sea shelf and slope be included in the network of marine protected areas now being instituted in the Southern Ocean, and that Ross Sea foodweb and ecosystem processes should be protected from extractive activities that will compromise its value as a reference area.
f) Other Annex V Matters	
WP 32 Australia	<i>ENHANCING THE ANTARCTIC PROTECTED AREAS DATABASE TO HELP ASSESS AND FURTHER DEVELOP THE PROTECTED AREAS SYSTEM.</i> Following its proposal at CEP XIII and after intersessional consultation, Australia proposes that the CEP: agree that the APA Database be expanded to include further relevant information to be provided by proponents when submitting management plans; encourage proponents to make Area boundaries available in a digital format suitable for use in GIS where possible; and request the Secretariat to take the steps necessary to accommodate these changes.
WP 41 Chile and Germany	<i>FOURTH PROGRESS REPORT ON THE DISCUSSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL WORKING GROUP ABOUT POSSIBILITIES FOR ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT OF FILDES PENINSULA AND ARDLEY ISLAND.</i> This paper informs on the progress made by the IWG on the management in Fildes peninsula and the pending tasks to finalize it. The Convenors propose to hold an IWG Meeting during CEP XIV in Buenos Aires in order to

	continue the discussion of all aspects related to the nature, scope and characteristics of a management scheme for the region.
WP 57 Russian Federation	<i>ON THE NEED OF CONSTANT MONITORING OF THE VALUES OF ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY PROTECTED AREAS AND ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY MANAGED AREAS.</i> This paper suggests that, in order to know whether the measures taken are sufficient to preserve the living nature values protected in ASPAs or ASMAs, management decisions to be considered during the review of the management plans should be based on the data on the state of living nature values as a result of proper monitoring programs.
IP 24 Germany	<i>PROGRESS REPORT ON THE RESEARCH PROJECT “CURRENT ENVIRONMENTAL SITUATION AND MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS FOR THE FILDES REGION (ANTARCTIC)”.</i> This paper describes the antecedents of this research project and informs on the future steps.
IP 69 Australia	<i>SUMMARY OF KEY FEATURES OF ANTARCTIC SPECIALLY MANAGED AREAS.</i> This paper presents a summary of the key features of the seven existing Antarctic Specially Managed Areas, using information drawn from management plans.
IP 102 Russia	<i>PRESENT ZOOLOGICAL STUDY AT MIRNY STATION AREA AND AT ASPA No 127 “HASWELL ISLAND”.</i> This paper reports on zoological studies and monitoring programs in the area since 1955, noting that sea mammals and birds prove to be sensitive indicators of environmental changes and primarily changes in the ocean ecosystem.
IP 109 Rep. of Korea	<i>COOPERATION MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES AT ASPAS IN 25 DE MAYO (KING GEORGE) ISLAND, SOUTH SHETLAND ISLANDS.</i> This paper informs on joint activities between the Republic of Korea and Argentina to initiate a review of the environmental management in two ASPAs King George Island, South Shetland Islands: ASPA 132 and ASPA 171.
8. CONSERVATION OF ANTARCTIC FLORA AND FAUNA	
a) Quarantine and Non-native Species	
WP 12 COMNAP and SCAR	<i>RAISING AWARENESS OF NON-NATIVE SPECIES INTRODUCTIONS: WORKSHOP RESULTS AND CHECKLISTS FOR SUPPLY CHAIN MANAGERS.</i> This paper informs on the results of a workshop held in 2010 which discussed the preliminary results of the IPY project “Aliens in Antarctica”. COMNAP and SCAR encourage the CEP to consider the inclusion of the COMNAP/SCAR checklists into the proposed “Non-Native Species Manual” which is currently under discussion.
WP 34 New Zealand	<i>REPORT OF THE INTERSESSIONAL CONTACT GROUP ON NON-NATIVE SPECIES 2010-2011.</i> New Zealand reports on the second year of work of the ICG. The paper reports on the conclusion of the group of the overall objective and key guiding principles for Parties’ actions to address risks posed by NNS. A NNS Manual is presented, containing generally applicable guidelines and resources to support the prevention and monitoring of and response to NNS introductions.
WP 53 SCAR	<i>MEASURES TO REDUCE THE RISK OF NON-NATIVE SPECIES INTRODUCTIONS TO THE ANTARCTIC REGION ASSOCIATED WITH FRESH FOODS.</i> SCAR informs on the development of simple practical measures to reduce the risk of introductions of non-native species into the Antarctic Treaty area via fresh foods, and requires comments on these guidelines as the basis for the development and eventual adoption of formal CEP guidelines via the Non-native Species Intersessional Contact Group.
IP 26 Germany	<i>PROGRESS REPORT ON THE RESEARCH PROJECT “CURRENT ENVIRONMENTAL SITUATION AND MANAGEMENT PROPOSALS FOR THE FILDES REGION (ANTARCTIC)”.</i> This paper describes the preliminary results of the research project.
IP 32 France	<i>REPORT ON IPY OSLO SCIENCE CONFERENCE SESSION ON NON-NATIVE SPECIES.</i> The scientific outputs of the IPY Oslo Science Conference related to Non-Native Species in the Polar Regions are compiled in this Information Paper for contribution to the discussion of the Committee on this issue.
IP 50 UK & Uruguay	<i>COLONISATION STATUS OF KNOWN NON-NATIVE SPECIES IN THE ANTARCTIC TERRESTRIAL ENVIRONMENT (UPDATED 2011).</i> This paper reports on the developments of knowledge of terrestrial NNS and provides data on new locations reported and efforts necessary to eradicate those species.
IP 68 Australia & SCAR	<i>ALIEN SPECIES DATABASE.</i> Australia informs that the Antarctic Data Centre has added to the database an online record entry form and a facility to upload images of observations / collections.
b) Specially Protected Species	
c) Other Annex II Matters	
WP 38 Germany	<i>ANTARCTIC DISCUSSION FORUM OF COMPETENT AUTHORITIES (DFCA) – IMPACTS OF UNDERWATER SOUND TO ANTARCTIC WATERS.</i> Based on the importance of the threat of anthropogenic underwater sound for the marine ecosystem, Germany proposes to give fresh impetus to the DFCA by organizing a Workshop to

	discuss the evaluation by Competent Authorities of this particular matter and report back to the CEP XV.
IP 27 Germany	<i>PROGRESS REPORT ON THE RESEARCH PROJECT 'WHALE MONITORING ANTARCTICA'</i> . This project is aimed to enhance the understanding of the distribution and abundance of Antarctic whales, and to provide reliable data to assess the impact of sound on these whales.
IP 29 Germany	<i>POTENTIAL OF TECHNICAL MEASURES TO REDUCE THE ACOUSTICAL EFFECTS OF AIRGUNS</i> . This paper reports on recent information on noise reduction for airgun based systems as well as possible alternative acoustic methods and equipment.
IP 33 SCAR	<i>SCAR'S CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE EXPLORATION AND RESEARCH OF SUBGLACIAL AQUATIC ENVIRONMENTS</i> . SCAR provides guidance to the scientific community with interests in exploring and conducting research on and in Antarctic subglacial aquatic environments.
IP 53 SCAR	<i>SCAR'S CODE OF CONDUCT FOR THE USE OF ANIMALS FOR SCIENTIFIC PURPOSES IN ANTARCTICA</i> . SCAR's proposed code of conduct provides guiding principles to the scientific community for research involving animals.
IP 94 Norway	<i>USE OF DOGS IN THE CONTEXT OF A COMMEMORATIVE CENTENNIAL EXPEDITION</i> . This paper informs that the Norwegian authorities received and considered a notification for an expedition in Antarctica involving the use of dogs. This action is banned through Annex II and Norwegian legislation, and an exemption from the ban was not granted.
9. ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING AND REPORTING	
WP 15 rev. 1 United Kingdom	<i>REMOTE SENSING TECHNIQUES FOR IMPROVED MONITORING OF ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGE IN ANTARCTICA</i> . The United Kingdom informs on the advantages of remote sensing compared with other techniques for monitoring the Antarctic environment and studying the effects of regional climate change. It recommends the CEP to endorse the potential of this tool and to continue to explore further applications.
IP 8 COMNAP	<i>COMNAP ENERGY MANAGEMENT WORKSHOP</i> . This document summarises the outcomes of the Workshop held in Buenos Aires in 2010 during the COMNAP Annual Meeting.
IP 35 Romania	<i>ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING AND ECOLOGICAL ACTIVITIES IN ANTARCTICA, 2010-2012</i> . This paper reports on research that will focus on climate change consequences in both polar area bio/ecosystems.
IP 51 SCAR & Australia	<i>THE SOUTHERN OCEAN OBSERVING SYSTEM (SOOS): AN UPDATE</i> . This paper presents an update to an IP presented last year, and summarizes progress with the design and implementation of a Southern Ocean Observing System (SOOS) over the last year.
10. INSPECTION REPORTS. PROGRESS TO THE INTERNATIONAL POLAR YEAR	
WP 1 Japan	<i>INSPECTION UNDERTAKEN BY JAPAN IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARTICLE VII OF THE ANTARCTIC TREATY AND ARTICLE XIV OF THE PROTOCOL ON ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION</i> . This paper informs on the results of the inspections conducted by Japan of six Antarctic stations between January 29th and February 10th 2010.
WP 51 Australia	<i>AUSTRALIAN ANTARCTIC TREATY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTOCOL INSPECTIONS: JANUARY 2010 AND JANUARY 2011</i> . This paper reports on the results of the inspections conducted by Australia of three Antarctic stations and one Protected Area, and one aerial observation in 2010; and the inspections of three Antarctic stations in 2011.
IP 4 Japan	<i>JAPANESE INSPECTION REPORT 2010</i> . Full report of the inspection conducted by Japan in 2010. (see also WP 1).
IP 39 Australia	<i>AUSTRALIAN ANTARCTIC TREATY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTOCOL INSPECTIONS JANUARY 2010</i> . Full report of the inspection. (see also WP 51)
IP 40 Australia	<i>AUSTRALIAN ANTARCTIC TREATY AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROTOCOL INSPECTIONS JANUARY 2011</i> . Full report of the inspection. (see also WP 51)
11. COOPERATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS	
IP 10 COMNAP	<i>COUNCIL OF MANAGERS OF NATIONAL ANTARCTIC PROGRAMS (COMNAP) REPORT TO ATCM XXXIII</i>
IP 31 CCAMLR	<i>REPORT BY THE SC-CAMLR OBSERVER TO THE FOURTEENTH MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION</i> . This paper reports on matters of common interest between the SC-CAMLR and the CEP, discussed at the last SC-CAMLR Meeting.
IP 54 SCAR	<i>SUMMARY OF SCAR'S STRATEGIC PLAN 2011-2016</i> . SCAR describes its mission to be the leading non-governmental, international facilitator and advocate of research in and from the Antarctic region, to provide objective and authoritative scientific advice to the Antarctic Treaty and others, and to bring emerging issues to the attention of policy makers.

IP 57 CCAMLR	<i>IP 57 REPORT OF THE CEP OBSERVER TO SC-CAMLR'S WORKING GROUP ON ECOSYSTEM MONITORING AND MANAGEMENT (WG-EMM)</i> . This paper reports on matters of common interest between the SC-CAMLR WG-EMM and the CEP, discussed at the last Meeting.
12. GENERAL MATTERS	
WP 28 Australia	<i>ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES RELATED TO THE PRACTICALITY OF REPAIR OR REMEDIATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL DAMAGE</i> . In Decision 4 (2010) the ATCM requested the CEP to consider environmental issues related to the practicality of reparation or remediation of environmental damage in the circumstances of Antarctica. This paper briefly reviews relevant past discussions and identifies several suggested points for inclusion in the Committee's response to that Decision.
IP 48 Australia	<i>THALA VALLEY WASTE REMOVAL</i> . This paper provides a progress report on the removal of waste from the old Thala Valley waste disposal site near Casey station.
IP 49 Australia	<i>RENEWABLE ENERGY AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY INITIATIVES AT AUSTRALIA'S ANTARCTIC STATIONS</i> . In response to Recommendation 4 of the 2010 ATME on Climate Change, this paper provides an overview of selected examples of Australia's energy management experience to date.
IP 61 SCAR	<i>THE SCAR ANTARCTIC CLIMATE EVOLUTION (ACE) PROGRAMME</i> . The SCAR ACE Programme represents the interests of a large land and marine geoscience research community focusing in deciphering the record of the onset and the response of the Antarctic ice sheets to past climate changes across a range of timescales. ACE coordinates the integration between geophysical and geological records of past ice sheet behavior and coupled climate, ocean, and ice sheet models.
IP 95 Netherlands	<i>PAYING FOR ECOSYSTEM SERVICES OF ANTARCTICA?</i> This paper describes the options for introducing payment for ecosystem schemes in Antarctica against the background of the concept of ecosystem services and the concept of Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) with some general examples.
IP 127 Ukraine	<i>THE CONSTRUCTION OF AN ORTHODOX CHAPEL AT VERNADSKY STATION</i> . Ukraine informs on the construction process of the chapel and the environmental procedures followed in advance.
13. ELECTION OF OFFICERS	
14. PREPARATION FOR NEXT MEETING	
WP 8 Australia	<i>PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR THE 35TH ANTARCTIC TREATY CONSULTATIVE MEETING, HOBART, 2012</i> . This paper requests the consideration of the Committee on a proposed schedule for the CEP XV.
15. ADOPTION OF THE REPORT	
16. CLOSING OF THE MEETING	

Appendix 1**Draft SGMP work plan for 2011/12**

Terms of Reference	Suggested tasks
ToR 1 to 3	Review draft management plans referred by CEP for intersessional review and provide advice to proponents
ToR 4 and 5*	Work with relevant Parties to ensure progress on review of management plans overdue for five-yearly review*
	As appropriate, consider actions arising from ASMA workshop*
	Review and update SGMP work plan
Working Papers	Prepare report for CEP XV against SGMP ToR 1 to 3
	Prepare report for CEP XV against SGMP ToR 4 and 5

Appendix 2

Provisional Agenda for CEP XV

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. Repair and Remediation of Environment Damage
13. General Matters
14. Election of Officers
15. Preparation for Next Meeting
16. Adoption of the Report
17. Closing of the Meeting

Appendix 3. CEP Five Year Work Plan.

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	Intersessional Period	CEP XV 2012	Intersessional Period	CEP XVI 2013	Intersessional Period	CEP XVII 2014	Intersessional Period	CEP XVIII 2015	Intersessional Period	CEP XIX 2016
Introduction of non-native species	1	NNS manual uploaded onto websites. SCAR lead informal group on draft guidelines for fresh food. COMNAP to provide advice	Discuss further preventive measures for inclusion in NNS manual including revised SCAR guidelines	Interested Members, experts, NAPs work on monitoring measures	Discuss further monitoring measures for inclusion in NSS manual	Interested members, experts, NAPs work on response measures	Discuss further response measures for inclusion in NNS manual	Prepare for review of manual-consider informal discussion group	Review non-native species manual		
Actions: 1. Continue developing practical guidelines & resources for all Antarctic operators. 2. Continue advancing recommendations from climate change ATME.											
Tourism and NGO activities	1	NZ pursue feedback and prepare final draft of Report	Consideration of CEP report and other ATME outcomes								
Actions: 1. Provide advice to ATCM as requested. 2. Advance recommendations from ship-borne tourism ATME.											
Global Pressure: Climate Change	1	UK and Norway lead development of methodology to classify ASPA vulnerability and risk. SCAR to participate	1) Discuss the results of intersessional work on methodology with a view to presenting draft classification of ASPAs; 2) progress on ATME recommendations		Standing agenda item. SCAR provides yearly update		Standing agenda item. SCAR provides yearly update		Standing agenda item. SCAR provides update		Standing agenda item. SCAR provides update
Actions: 1. Consider implications of climate change for management of Antarctic environment. 2. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME.											
Processing new and revised protected / managed area management plans	1	SGMP / conducts work as per agreed work plan . Members review & Experts advise on provisions and practices of ASMA Management Plans. Secretariate establish website links	Develop guidance for establishing ASMAs Consider-ation 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	Consideration of SGMP / report
Actions: 1. Refine the process for reviewing new and revised management plans. 2. Update existing guidelines. 3. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME.											

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	Intersessional Period	CEP XV 2012	Intersessional Period	CEP XVI 2013	Intersessional Period	CEP XVII 2014	Intersessional Period	CEP XVIII 2015	Intersessional Period	CEP XIX 2016
Maintain the list of Historic Sites and Monuments	2										
Actions: 1. Maintain the list and consider new proposals as they arise. 2. Consider strategic issues as necessary.		Secretariate update list of HSMs	Standing item Progress on informal discussions on HSM	Secretariate update list of HSMs	Standing item	Secretariate update list of HSMs	Standing item	Secretariate update list of HSMs	Standing item		
Monitoring and state of the environment reporting	2										
Actions: 1. Identify key environmental indicators and tools. 2. Establish a process for reporting to the ATCM. 3. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME.		SCAR review	Report from SCAR regarding SC-ADM support for CEP work								
Exchange of Information	2										
Actions: 1. Assign to the Secretariat. 2. Monitor and facilitate easy use of the EIES.		Informal discussion lead by the Secretariat	Secretariat Report		Secretariat Report		Secretariat Report		Secretariat Report		Secretariat Report
Biodiversity knowledge	2										
Actions: 1. Maintain awareness of threats to existing biodiversity. 2. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME		SCAR prepare review of science since 2004 of biotic effects of underwater acoustic noise	Discussion of SCAR update on underwater noise								
Site specific guidelines for tourist-visited sites	3										
Actions: 1. Review site specific guidelines as required. 2. Provide advice to ATCM as required.			Standing agenda item; Parties to report on their reviews of site guidelines		Standing agenda item; Parties to report on their reviews of site guidelines		Standing agenda item; Parties to report on their reviews of site guidelines		Standing agenda item; Parties to report on their reviews of site guidelines		Standing agenda item; Parties to report on their reviews of site guidelines

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	Intersessional Period	CEP XV 2012	Intersessional Period	CEP XVI 2013	Intersessional Period	CEP XVII 2014	Intersessional Period	CEP XVIII 2015	Intersessional Period	CEP XIX 2016
Implementing and Improving the EIA provisions of Annex I	3										
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		Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required	Consideration of ICG reports on draft CEE, as required	Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required	Consideration of ICG reports on draft CEE, as required	Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required	Consideration of ICG reports on draft CEE, as required	Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required	Consideration of ICG reports on draft CEE, as required	Establish ICG to review draft CEEs as required	Consideration of ICG reports on draft CEE, as required
Specially protected species	3										
Actions: 1. Consider listing / de-listing proposals as required.											
Overview of the protected areas system / EDA	3										
Actions: 1. Apply the Environmental Domains Analysis (EDA) to enhance the protected areas system. 2. Advance recommendations from climate change ATME. 3. Maintain and develop Protected Area database.		Secretariat modify database as in Resolution XX/WP32. Members begin working towards expansion of database for spatial data; Secretariat to maintain PA Database					Discuss possible implications of an updated gap analysis based on EDA				
Emergency response action and contingency planning	3										
Actions: 1. Advance recommendations from ship-borne tourism ATME. 2. Develop advice in response to request from ATCM Decision 4 (2010).		Members consider experience and possible papers to progress advice to ATCM	Discuss work and relevance to Repair and Remediation issue in relation also to request from ATCM	Discuss Work	ICG	Discussion	ICG	Discussion	ICG	Final Recs to the ATCM	

Issue / Environmental Pressure Actions	CEP Priority	Intersessional Period	CEP XV 2012	Intersessional Period	CEP XVI 2013	Intersessional Period	CEP XVII 2014	Intersessional Period	CEP XVIII 2015	Intersessional Period	CEP XIX 2016
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										
Actions: 1. Review inspection reports as required.			Standing item		Standing item		Standing item		Standing item		
Waste	3										
Actions: 1. Develop guidelines for best practice disposal of waste including human waste.			COMNAP provides information for improved waste management				COMNAP reviews information from 2006 waste management workshop				
Energy management	4										
Actions: 1. Develop best-practice guidelines for energy management at stations and bases.											
Outreach and education	4										
Actions: 1. Review current examples and identify opportunities for greater education and outreach.			[Pending ATCM 34 discussion]				Dedicated time for discussion				